



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 9, 2020

No. 106

House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Thursday, June 11, 2020, at 9 a.m.

Senate

TUESDAY, JUNE 9, 2020

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, we need You more than human help. Restore us to Your favor, surrounding us with the shield of Your mercy. We have been shaken by forces that have come against us and look to You, our redeemer and friend. Lord, we are grateful that, though wrong seems strong, You continue to rule.

Fill our lawmakers with reverence and trust in Your prevailing providence. May that reverential awe keep them on the path of courage, integrity, and wisdom. Lord, remind them that You have invited them to seek and discover Your might. You declare in Psalm 50:15: "Call on me in the day of trouble; I will deliver you."

We praise Your Holy Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 1 minute in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

IOWA'S PRIMARY ELECTION

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, the House of Representatives has passed a bill that is kind of like a one-size-fits-all for elections, meaning that everything ought to be run out of Washington, DC, which is contrary to what we have done in this country for 240 years, wherein we have had 50 States running the elections. I want to refer to what happens in the State of Iowa.

Last week, Iowans voted in record numbers in our June primary. In most elections, about 40 percent of Iowans choose to vote by absentee ballot. This year, in our primary and, understandably, because of the pandemic, the vast majority cast its votes by absentee ballot—a State decision, a personal decision, not something dictated by Washington.

As I have already referred to, there are those here in Washington, DC—in Congress and maybe outside of Congress—who say that, unless the Federal Government mandates that States adopt a whole new, centralized, non-optional vote-by-mail system before November, Americans will not be able to vote from home.

Iowa's successful primary election shows that the absentee ballot system that is already in place in our State—and in most States—that is run by our county auditors is up to the task. We have proven that. Every Iowan who wants to vote absentee in November

can do so, and those who want to vote in person can also do so safely.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

JUSTICE IN POLICING ACT AND HEROES ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam President, as protests over the death of George Floyd continue, House and Senate Democrats came together yesterday to unveil sweeping reforms to our Nation's police departments.

The Justice in Policing Act was not only a response to the recent protests but a reflection of years of failed efforts to root out injustice and racial bias in our law enforcement. The bill would ban the use of choke holds and other tactics that have left Black Americans dead. It would limit the transfer of military weaponry and equipment to police departments. It would change the legal standard to make it easier to hold police accountable for misconduct when they use

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S2771

deadly force on American citizens, and through increased data and transparency, as well as important modifications to training and practices, it would help prevent police misconduct in the first place.

This is a very strong bill, and rightly so. I give tremendous credit to Senators BOOKER, HARRIS, and so many others who contributed, as well as the Black Caucus, led by KAREN BASS and Chairman NADLER of the Judiciary. They put together a very strong bill. The reason is simple. The moment does not call for half measures.

Hundreds of thousands of American protesters are not asking us to chip away around the edges. They want bold reform and meaningful changes to assist them in something that all too often delivers unequal justice for too many Black Americans, and that has existed that way for too, too long. Well, that kind of bold reform and meaningful change is what the Justice in Policing Act will deliver—meaningful change. Democrats are going to fight very, very hard to make this proposal a reality.

Now, of course, in the Senate, it is ultimately up to Leader McConnell to decide what proposals, if any, come to the Senate floor. That is his prerogative as majority leader. But for 2 weeks, Leader McConnell has refused to respond to my requests for the Senate to consider a police reform bill before July 4, the end of the current work period. I have heard the Republican leader speak to the frustrations that have swept the Nation. I trust he is aware of the many abuses that have been allowed to persist unchecked in our police departments. Where is Leader McConnell on actually doing something about it?

Of course, there is another crisis at the moment, the COVID pandemic. According to reports in the press, Leader McConnell has told the Republican caucus not to expect another relief bill until late July at the earliest. This is happening even as some States begin loosening restrictions on business and travel. But even as that happens, our economy is hampered by severe Depression-level unemployment. While the number of new cases is falling on the east coast, the number of cases remains steady in much of the country and is increasing in a good number of States.

We are coming to a whole lot of cliffs. States are preparing their budgets in advance of the new fiscal year in July. If they don't get help soon, they may be forced to make severe cuts to public service, and thousands, hundreds of thousands, and even millions will be laid off—hard-working State and local officials whom our communities depend on.

There are other cliffs as well. The 3-month moratorium on eviction expires. Unemployment expires July 31. There are so many cliffs here, and make no mistake about it, COVID is related to racial justice as well. In the HEROES

bill, for instance, hazard workers and frontline workers get extra pay—hazard pay. More than 40 percent of them are minorities. These are the people on our frontlines. Rental assistance for people who might be evicted, a large percentage of minority folks cannot afford to own a home or rent, so we must act on that as well.

So the kind of racial justice we are talking about, the kind of inequality that exists—some of it—a good chunk of it would be relieved if we passed the HEROES Act, COVID 4 bill. Both of these are important to do. Racial justice, civil rights, a global pandemic, and economic disaster—these are not merely issues of the month but of this moment in American history. It is truly a time of historic challenge, and Leader McConnell and the Republican Senate are missing in action. There is no commitment to consider police reform and no urgency to provide our country relief, despite the upcoming cliffs that are going to be soon upon us.

Now there is a full 4 weeks remaining before July 4. I say to Leader McConnell: commit to a police reform bill on the Senate floor. Work with us on another emergency package that can come to the floor as well before July 4. We have waited too long already.

For weeks, we Democrats have had to relentlessly pressure our Republican colleagues to even hold the most routine oversight hearings. The Republican majority on the Homeland Security Committee, in particular, has wasted time these past few weeks trying to smear the family of the President's political opponent instead. Here we have a major crisis—a major crisis on the health front, on the economic front, on the racial justice front, and what are so many of our Republican friends doing? Raising back already discredited conspiracy theories to go after the President's political opponent at a time when Americans are calling for unity and coming together and doing something about our problems. It is a shame.

The Homeland Security Committee will finally, today, conduct a hearing with the FEMA Administrator for the first time in so long. This crisis has been raging for months. More than 8 weeks ago, we passed a \$3 trillion bill. Why is it taking so long to have any oversight at all? Finally, members of the committee will have the opportunity to press administration officials as to why, in the early days of the pandemic, the distribution of PPE and other critical medical supplies was marked by so much confusion, secrecy, incompetence, and delays. In fact, Senators WARREN, BLUMENTHAL, and I formally requested an investigation into Project Airbridge, the name of the Trump administration's opaque medical supply chain management project, which, by most reports, was a failure. Why aren't we looking into why that went wrong, what went wrong, and how we can correct it?

The harsh fact of the matter is this: We have lost too many Americans,

frontline workers, and hospital emergency personnel to this horrible COVID-19 disease. We will never know how many we lost because we weren't better prepared with the necessary protective equipment. The Trump administration's failure should be thoroughly investigated so it does not make the same mistake again if there is a resurgence of the disease.

Meanwhile, America is still waiting for the President to even acknowledge the issues of police violence and racial justice that are driving protests across the country, including across the street from the White House.

The President appears too preoccupied trying to emulate Richard Nixon, of all Presidents, and he doesn't offer even a scintilla of leadership. The President seems too preoccupied with his political precariousness to even try to bring the country together.

As former Defense Secretary Mattis wrote, "Donald Trump is the first president in my lifetime who does not try to unite the American people—does not even pretend to try. Instead, he tries to divide us. We are witnessing the consequences of three years of this deliberate effort. We are witnessing the consequences of three years without mature leadership. We can unite without him . . ."

And do that, we must, as Americans. Those words were not written by some liberal Democrat whom they will call names, cast aspersions on, never discussing the argument. It was written by one of our great military leaders, former Defense Secretary General Mattis.

Every day provides fresh evidence that this country will have to unite in spite of the President, not because of him.

I yield the floor.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

PROTESTS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, several times now I have praised the peaceful demonstrations protesting racial injustice and the killings of Black Americans. I am grateful that after several harrowing days of looting and riots, law enforcement restored order and helped these peaceful protests be heard.

Notwithstanding the far-left calls to disband the police altogether, I believe most Americans are ready to consider how the memories of Black Americans like George Floyd and Breonna Taylor can move us to continue combating residual racism.

Today, I need to discuss a different pressing problem that concerns Americans' constitutional rights. It is becoming clear to many Americans, including many who appreciate and applaud the recent protests, that our national life during this pandemic has slid toward a double standard.

For weeks, State and local leaders put normal American life totally on ice and asked citizens to prioritize fighting the virus. For weeks, the mainstream media heaped scorn on any small citizen protest, outdoor gathering, or even the suggestion that other important values might require a reappraisal of certain restrictions.

Well, the American people did their part. They made necessary sacrifices that clearly helped the country, and they are ready to continue doing their part as our reopening carefully proceeds. But now, many Americans feel they have just seen those fastidious regulations and that puritanical zeal disappear in an instant because a new cause has emerged that powerful people agree with.

A month ago, small protest demonstrations were widely condemned as reckless and selfish. Now, massive rallies that fill entire cities are not just praised but, in fact, are called especially brave because of the exact same health risk that brought condemnation when the cause was different.

People just spent the spring watching their small businesses dissolve or canceling weddings or missing religious observances for the longest spells in their lives or missing the last days of a loved one's life and then missing the funeral. Never were the American people told about any exemption for things they felt strongly about.

I have no criticism for the millions of Americans who peacefully demonstrated in recent days. Their cause is beyond righteous. It is the inconsistency from leaders that has been baffling. The same Governor of Michigan who argued that letting people carefully shop for vegetable seeds—vegetable seeds—would be too dangerous during the pandemic, now poses for photographs with groups of protesters. Here in the District of Columbia, the mayor celebrates massive street protests. She actually joins them herself. But on her command, churches and houses of worship remain shut. I believe even the largest church buildings in the District are still subject to the 10-person limit for things the mayor deems inessential.

The rights of free speech, free assembly, and the free exercise of religion are all First Amendment rights. They have the same constitutional pedigree. Apparently, while protests are now permissible, prayer is still too dangerous. Politicians are now picking and choosing within the First Amendment itself.

Last week, one county in California's Bay area seriously attempted to issue guidance that allowed protests of 100 people but still—still capped all other social gatherings at 12 people and banned outdoor religious gatherings altogether—banned outdoor religious gatherings altogether. Figure that one out.

These governments are acting like the coronavirus discriminates based on the content of people's speech, but, alas, it is only the leaders themselves

who are doing that. It is now impossible to avoid the conclusion that local and State leaders are using their power to encourage constitutionally protected conduct which they personally appreciate while continuing to ban constitutionally protected conduct which they personally feel is less important.

In New York City, Mayor de Blasio makes no effort to hide this subjectivity. At one point, he recounted our Nation's history with racism, compared that to "a devout religious person who wants to go back to religious services" and concluded, "Sorry, that is not the same question."

Well, the American people's constitutional liberties do not turn—do not turn on a mayor's intuition. Politicians do not get to play red light, green light within the First Amendment. The Bill of Rights is not some a-la-carte menu that leaders may sample as they please. It is hard to see any rational set of rules by which mass protests should continue to be applauded, but small, careful religious services should continue to be banned.

These prominent Democrats are free to let social protests outrank religion in their own consciences if they choose, but they do not get to impose their ranking on everyone else. This is precisely the point of freedom of conscience. That is precisely the point of the First Amendment.

Weeks ago, citizens sued the mayor of Louisville, KY, when he tried to ban drive-in Easter services while imposing no restrictions on the parking lots of secular businesses. A brilliant district judge had to remind him and the whole country that in America, faith can never be shoved into second class. It seems at least a few local leaders still need to learn that lesson. I hope they learn it soon.

The American people's response to the coronavirus was courageous and patriotic.

On the advice of experts, our Nation sacrificed a great deal to protect our medical system. Politicians must not repay that sacrifice with constitutionally dubious double standards.

GREAT AMERICAN OUTDOORS ACT

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, on an entirely different matter, yesterday our colleagues voted overwhelmingly to advance the Great American Outdoors Act. Thanks to the guiding leadership of colleagues like Senators DAINES and GARDNER, we have a rare opportunity to take a huge step forward with some of our Nation's most cherished treasures.

Every year, America's national parks, forests, wildlife refuges, battlefields, and public lands draw hundreds of millions of visits from across the country and around the world—hunters and anglers, backpackers and climbers, bird watchers and road trippers, school groups and scientists. Across hundreds of millions of acres, there is room for recreation and conservation alike.

Where our Nation makes its natural wonders possible, local communities thrive. According to the National Park Service, park visitors contribute to more than \$40 billion in economic output in adjacent towns. From local hotels and restaurants to the outdoor recreation industry itself, they supported nearly 330,000 jobs.

So it would be difficult to overstate the importance of our public lands in the lives of the American people. When the Senate passes legislation to secure permanent funding for keeping them safe and accessible, we will be ushering in a bright future for American recreation and conservation.

At the same time—and just as importantly—we will be addressing the areas where decades of funding levels for routine maintenance have not kept pace, leaving some of our parks and public lands inaccessible and potentially unsafe.

This is where the rubber meets the road. This is where all of our love for the great American outdoors needs to be backed up with some sober accounting.

In Senator GARDNER's backyard, in the U.S. Forest Service's Rocky Mountain region, last year's totals put the costs of backlog maintenance projects at nearly half a billion dollars. From upkeep of roads, bridges, and dams to updates of wastewater and drinking water systems, we are talking about projects with real consequences for recreation, conservation, and local economies.

In Kentucky, we know all too well what happens when urgent maintenance is neglected. At Mammoth Cave National Park, for example, untreated sewer leaks in past years have restricted access to portions of the largest cave system in the world and even threatened some of its native species.

Today, more than \$90 million in maintenance is still outstanding at that particular park. We are still waiting on funding to rehabilitate cave trails that haven't seen major investment since the 1930s.

At the Forest Service's London district office, Kentucky rangers are still waiting for funding for critical security and accessibility updates.

Like any prized asset, public lands need regular maintenance. We shouldn't let key infrastructure languish for decades and then fight uphill to make up for lost time.

This is a familiar problem that is felt in different ways in every corner of our Nation, so the solution will need to be just as sweeping. Fortunately, as last night's lopsided vote demonstrates, our colleagues have assembled a deeply bipartisan set of solutions that our country deserves.

I am proud the work led by our colleagues from Montana and Colorado have received the endorsement of hundreds of national and local advocates for American recreation and conservation. I urge all Senators to join the experts and support the bill.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019—
MOTION TO PROCEED—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of the motion to proceed to H.R. 1957, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

Motion to proceed to Calendar No. 75, H.R. 1957, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. THUNE. Madam President, as I begin this morning, I would like to just briefly comment on the outlandish idea of dismantling police departments that has seen substantial coverage in recent days. While there are exceptions, the vast majority of our Nation's police officers are men and women of character who care deeply about protecting everyone in their communities, and they provide an essential service—a service that we cannot do without.

The idea that any city can exist without a police force is so absurd that it is difficult to believe anyone is seriously discussing it. We absolutely need to look at policies at the State, local, and Federal levels to ensure that we are holding police officers to the highest standards, and I hope we will be having serious bipartisan discussions on these issues in the coming weeks.

I know at least one Senate Republican has already introduced legislation to require law enforcement agencies to report the use of lethal force. But bipartisan discussions will not be forwarded by extreme and irresponsible proposals like abolishing the police departments that help protect our communities. I hope that such proposals will not gain any traction here in the U.S. Senate.

BUSINESS BEFORE THE SENATE

Madam President, we are very busy—hard at work—here in the Senate. Our main business on the floor this week will be the Great American Outdoors Act, legislation crafted by Senators DAINES and GARDNER and others, that will help address the significant maintenance backlog in our national parks, among other things.

Out of the limelight, Senators will also be discussing how best to respond

at the Federal level to the tragedy of George Floyd's killing.

Responding to the coronavirus continues to be at the top of our agenda. Right now, we are focused on monitoring the implementation of the \$2.4 trillion that Congress has provided so that we can identify what more we need to do to fight this virus.

Our committees play a leading role in this, and they have kept up a steady stream of hearings examining implementation and identifying next steps.

This week, we have no fewer than eight—eight—committee hearings on various aspects of the COVID crisis, including unemployment insurance, a Senate Finance Committee hearing later today that I will be participating in, reopening schools, and the Federal Government's procurement and distribution strategies.

The Democratic leader has spent a lot of time on the floor lately, complaining about what is happening in the Senate. He is, apparently, not happy that we are in session, and he claims we are not doing anything on the coronavirus.

Well, on the first point, I would just like to say that the majority leader brought the Senate back into session because we have responsibilities that we need to fulfill. One of the issues that we have to respond to, as a matter of our constitutional obligation, is the issue of dealing with nominations, both to judicial and executive branches of our government. We continue to have to do that.

There are important vacancies that we need to fill, some important national security vacancies, judicial vacancies. Last week, we confirmed the inspector general for the pandemic, somebody who was confirmed by a 75-to-15 vote.

Now, it is possible that we could do those and not be here. The Democratic leader has said on various occasions he doesn't know why we are here doing these types of nominations. Well, the reason we are here doing these types of nominations is that they insist on it.

Even in cases where the nominee has broad bipartisan support—in some cases, overwhelming support—we continue to have to stay here and go through the procedural roadblocks that Democrats throw up to getting these nominees across the finish line.

In fact, if you look at the historical context of nominations, we are living in unprecedented times. The Democrats have filibustered now—totaled—314 nominees that President Trump has put forward. For all of the previous Presidents combined—all of the previous Presidents combined in our Nation's history—only on 244 occasions did cloture have to be invoked to shut down a filibuster on nominees.

Think about that. In the first 3½ years of President Trump's term, we now have had 314 nominees—judicial or executive—filibustered. In the rest of the history of the U.S. Senate, even if you go back and say that the advent of

the filibuster is only in the last half century or so. Think about that: 244 times, throughout all of the Presidencies combined—combined—in our history, but this President has seen his nominees filibustered 314 times.

So if the Democratic leader wants to know why we are here doing nominees, that is why. We have to. It is our job. It is our constitutional responsibility. If the minority continues to make it as difficult as they have and continues to filibuster and force the leader to file cloture on all these nominees, we have to be here to vote. That is our job, and that is why we are here.

Of course, there is also the work, as I said, of responding to the coronavirus. There is also work we have to do that doesn't stop just because there is a pandemic.

If you look at the Paycheck Protection Program, when it ran out of money, it took way too long to convince Democrats to do something as simple as appropriate more funding for pandemic-stricken small businesses.

Funding our government, protecting our Nation, making sure these important positions in the government, as I mentioned, are filled—we just can't skip those things because of the coronavirus, and they have made it increasingly difficult—virtually impossible—for us to do any of this by unanimous consent while the Senate was out of session.

As for the Democratic leader's charge that the Senate hasn't been doing anything on coronavirus, as I pointed out, that is just a simply ridiculous charge to make. Coronavirus has been at the forefront of the Senate activity since we returned in May.

Our committees have held a constant stream of hearings examining implementation of the coronavirus assistance that we have already passed and looking forward to what will be needed in the future.

As I mentioned, last week, we confirmed the nomination of Brian D. Miller to be Special Inspector General for Pandemic Recovery at the Treasury Department, a key position with responsibility for ensuring the coronavirus funding is spent properly.

We also passed last week legislation to update the Paycheck Protection Program to give additional flexibility to small businesses. Clearly—clearly—the Senate has been making coronavirus a priority.

I would argue that much of what we have already done is having the desired result. The jobs numbers that came out last week are encouraging. Obviously, we have a lot of work to do. We have to keep it in perspective. It is no time to be spiking the football. But those job numbers were encouraging.

I think one of the reasons we had those strong numbers is because we have a very resilient economy, No. 1, and, No. 2, because of policies we have put in place—tax and regulatory policies that have encouraged businesses to invest, consumers to spend.

The PPP program, the Paycheck Protection Program, obviously, I think has done a lot of good out there. It has kept, literally, millions of businesses in business. It has kept, literally, tens of millions of workers employed, and that is exactly what we wanted to see happen.

Those dollars were among the best spent dollars, I think, of all the several trillion dollars that we put out there. My State of South Dakota is a good example. We have over 21,000 businesses that have benefited from the Paycheck Protection Program, to the tune of about \$1.6 billion. I bet, if you look at the numbers in every other State around the country, you would see the same thing. It is one of the reasons, I believe, that we are seeing some encouraging economic numbers and employment numbers. Let's hope that we can continue to build on that.

I guess that when the Democratic leader complains that the Senate hasn't been doing anything on coronavirus, what he actually means to say is the Senate hasn't passed another \$3 trillion bill. The House of Representatives, the Democrat majority there, in a very partisan way with zero Republican support and, in fact, some Democrats opposing it, passed another \$3 trillion.

Well, it is true we haven't done that here in the Senate. It is because we don't believe we should be playing fast and loose with the American people's money like that. As I pointed out, Congress has already provided \$2.4 trillion in funding to respond to the virus, which is a staggering amount of money, equal to roughly half of the 2020 Federal budget.

It was money we needed to spend, and we were glad to do it. We will probably have to spend more before this crisis is over, but we have to make sure that we are appropriating what is really needed and not mindlessly throwing around trillions of dollars. The way we do that is by monitoring the implementation of the funding that we have already put out there, that has already been delivered, which is exactly what we have been doing.

I have to say, for a lot of the funding that has been authorized, some of it hasn't even been put out there yet. The \$175 billion that we have authorized to help healthcare providers—hospitals, nursing homes, those folks on the frontline—only about \$75 billion of that has been made available already. So less than 50 percent of those dollars are even out there yet.

It is pretty hard to decide whether you are going to throw more money at something before you have determined whether the money you have already spent is having the desired effect and whether there is a need for more. So we need to see where that money goes before we decide what else we need to appropriate.

I have said it before, and I will say it again. Every dollar that we have provided to fight the coronavirus is bor-

rowed money, a significant addition to an already massive amount of national debt.

Democrats may like to pretend that we can continue to borrow more and more money forever, but the truth is we cannot. The greater our national debt, the greater the threat it represents to the health of our economy, not to mention the future of today's younger workers.

So while we may need to borrow more money to meet our needs before the crisis is over, it is crucial that we keep that borrowing as low as possible and spend only what is absolutely necessary.

So far, the Democrats' major proposal for the next phase of our coronavirus response is a \$3 trillion bill produced by the House of Representatives that mentions the word "cannabis" more often than it mentions the word "job," which I think tells you all you need to know about how seriously some are taking this issue.

If Democrats really wanted to move additional relief forward, they would be sitting down with Republicans to develop reasonable legislation that actually has a chance of passing Congress and being signed by the President, but they are not. Instead, they are proposing outlandish, far-left messaging bills and engaging in the kind of partisanship that has become the modus operandi during this administration.

While I am talking about Democrats' unhelpfulness, I just want to mention the Democratic leader's offensive suggestion on the floor last week that the judges that we are confirming in the Senate will not protect civil rights. This is, unfortunately, right in line with their general attitude that the only legitimate judges are Democrat judges, but it is, nevertheless, particularly irresponsible to be fanning the flames of division in this country right now by suggesting, untruthfully, that only Democrats' preferred judicial candidates will show a commitment to upholding civil rights.

The continued partisanship, even during a national crisis, has been pretty disheartening. But I am a hopeful guy, and I like to think that at least some Democrats are more interested in actually helping Americans than in far-left messaging bills, and I would invite those Democrats to work with us.

There is a lot more that we need to do before this pandemic is over, and Republicans are committed to getting our country through this crisis and to helping Americans thrive on the other side.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CARPER. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

H.R. 1957

Mr. CARPER. Madam President, the bill before us today, the Great American Outdoors Act, is landmark legislation. It would fulfill a longstanding promise to the American people to fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

This measure will also make a downpayment on deferred maintenance plans of our Nation's beloved public lands, which includes over 400 national parks. It also includes more than 500 national wildlife refuges that are under the jurisdiction of the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee on which I serve as ranking member.

While I am proud to support the Great American Outdoors Act, we would be remiss if we did not put the Senate's consideration of this legislation in the context of everything else that is happening in our country today. As we have learned in the 15 days since the death of George Floyd, we also have other longstanding promises to fulfill. Let me mention four of them. The first is a promise of an end to racial violence in this country and a new beginning in the pursuit of racial justice. The second would be the promise of equality. The third would be the promise of a more perfect Union called for in our Constitution's preamble. The fourth, and last, would be the promise of a dream articulated nearly 57 years ago on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial, not far from where we are gathered here today, by the late Martin Luther King.

Our national and State parks have always been places that bring people from all backgrounds together. Our national historic sites and monuments commemorate the events that have forged and tested us as a nation, as well as the sacrifices that we have made in our quest to become that more perfect Union.

They are also places from which people have called on their government, our government, for change and for equality. Yes, our national parks have served as places of protest, protected under the Constitution that Delaware was the first State to ratify on December 7, 1787. In fact, Delaware's national park, one of the newest in the Nation, was created, in large part, to celebrate that history.

The recent murders of George Floyd in Minneapolis and Breonna Taylor in Louisville have sparked, as we know, widespread civil unrest. From coast to coast, millions of Americans have come together to protest the deaths of unarmed Black Americans and to call for change, to call for justice, and to call for racial equality. In Washington, DC, some of those demonstrations have taken place in our National Park System.

Lafayette Square, the site of gassing and the troubling use of crowd dispersion devices last week in response to a peaceful demonstration, has seen its share of protests and turmoil. In its history, before the marble monuments

it now contains, the square served as a slave market, and it housed troops during the War of 1812 when the White House and the U.S. Capitol—this Capitol—were burned.

Today, and nearly every day, people are gathered in Lafayette Square in front of the White House, calling for action, as we debate the bill before us. But in January and February of 1917, women staged 2 months of protests out of a row house located on Lafayette Square in the pursuit of women's suffrage—the right to vote, one of our most sacred privileges.

Other national park sites in Washington have been front and center of the calls for racial justice in the last several days: the National Mall, the Lincoln Memorial, and one of our newest national historic sites, the memorial to Martin Luther King, who taught our country about the power of peaceful protests.

These places inspire us. They allow our voices to be heard, but they also give us strength; they give us solace; and they give us the opportunity to heal. The bill before us today helps us to ensure that our public lands remain places where we can remember, where we can reflect, and we can recharge.

Sometimes when I speak on the Senate floor, I share anecdotes from my morning runs. A number of them over the years have been on the National Mall as I run from the Capitol to the Lincoln Memorial and then past the Vietnam Veterans Memorial, etched with the names of over 58,000 men and women with whom I served in Southeast Asia. No matter how tired I might be when I get up in the morning, when I begin those runs, as I pass and pause at each of these places, I feel inspired, I feel rejuvenated, and I feel more determined than ever to take up our work in service to the American people who sent us here.

Interestingly, I have heard a similar sentiment from the hundreds of Delawareans who have asked me to support this legislation before us today. Many of our parks provide visitors a place to reflect, to reconnect, and to enjoy the beauties of nature. That is, in no small part, because of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Many of our colleagues know that Delaware has a proud history as the First State—the First State National Historical Park, which we worked for a decade to create not long ago, tells the story of the role Delaware played in the establishment of our country. Our national park is unique, with historical sites in all three of Delaware's counties that connect our communities, much like our State parks do.

What you may not know, though, is that the first land acquisition through the State side of the Land and Water Conservation Program in this country occurred in Delaware. Brandywine Creek State Park, located just north of Wilmington, DE—my hometown—was established in 1965. At the time of this monumental acquisition, there was not

much of a State park system in Delaware and certainly not in New Castle County, our northernmost county.

Since that time, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has enabled the purchase and development of many additional State parks that are crown jewels in all three counties of the First State. I will mention a few of them: White Clay Creek, Cape Henlopen, Fox Point, Bellevue, Killens Pond, and many more.

For us in Delaware, these spaces are places of community. People from all walks of life come to these parks for many different reasons. Some come to fish, others to bike, others to hike, play sports, fly kites, swim, go birding, learn, enjoy picnics, and enjoy concerts. Those are just some of the reasons why people come to our national parks—not just from Delaware, not just from America but from all over the world.

Some of the parks I have just mentioned might exist without the Land and Water Conservation Fund, but without it, they would not be the community cornerstones that they are today. When a park is revitalized, it can become the nerve center of a community and create new opportunities to bring us together. In many cases, we have seen just that happen in our State. For example, Bellevue State Park—located not far from our home—has been home to a community garden program for decades, providing a place for families like my own when our sons were young who may not have a lot of land on which to grow their own fruits and vegetables.

In 2017, just 3 years ago, the city of Wilmington was awarded an LWCF grant to improve Father Tucker Park, which had been in disrepair for decades. The park is vital for play, for cultural gatherings, and sports activities. It is now a valuable hub of that community.

Further, the Land and Water Conservation Fund enabled the first public pool in Kent County at the Killens Pond State Park, 10 miles south of Dover. It is now the Killens Pond Water Park, and it has grown quite popular with residents from across Kent County and well beyond Kent County's borders.

This legislation also helps us to bring economic activity to our communities, something that people might not think of at first blush. In Delaware, the Land and Water Conservation Fund has enabled an incredible network of greenways and trails that connect community facilities and institutions with businesses. People come from all over the country to ride, to run, and to walk on them.

Basic investment in preservation of land and investment in paths and trails is a tangible community building enterprise. People can get on their bicycle in downtown Wilmington, ride through the city and out into the suburbs and to the Delaware River in Fox Point State Park, just 3 miles from our

home. I might add, there is another one, too, from the train station where I caught the train this morning to come down here. There is the Jack Markell Trail that links the riverfront in Wilmington, DE, to New Castle, DE, where Ben Franklin first landed and brought with him the deeds to Delaware and Pennsylvania. Those paths that I just mentioned expand horizons; they connect people to each other; and they create common ground in our communities.

The Delaware State Parks Youth Conservation Corps even provides jobs and environmental restoration opportunities throughout our parks for young people from all backgrounds.

What is more, our Delaware State parks offer free summer concerts. These concert series attract different generations and diverse audiences. While the 2020 summer concert series was, unfortunately, canceled due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, Delaware State parks have remained open, and, get this, our State has waived entrance fees.

As it became clear that physical location was key to preventing the spread of the novel coronavirus, Delawareans, especially those in urban areas, sought solitude in our parks. For many, connecting with nature was critical for mental wellness, and, now, making that connection has grown more popular than ever. One example of that is Brandywine Creek State Park. Located just a few miles south of our border with Pennsylvania, it has seen record visitation this year.

As I mentioned earlier in my remarks, I have heard from hundreds of constituents in support of the Great American Outdoors Act. Many of them have shared stories about their treasured moments in State and national parks, particularly during troubled times.

I want to close my remarks today by sharing one of those stories from a friend, as it turns out, the executive director of Delaware Wild Lands, and her name is Kate Hackett. About a year and a half ago, Kate, along with her family and another family, traveled to a place called Big Bend National Park in the State of Texas. This park is on the U.S.-Mexican border, as some of you know. These two families were distressed by what was happening along our borders and wanted to visit border towns to experience their humanity themselves.

As the two families hiked along the Rio Grande River, Kate's friend sang her favorite lullaby, not in English but in Spanish. Her song echoed in the canyon. When she paused, an unknown voice from across the border emerged with the next verse of the same song. These two strangers—divided by the depths of a canyon—alternated verses, savoring a shared experience, regardless of borders, regardless of race, regardless of languages.

I was moved at the time to hear how Kate was able to use her family's outdoor experience that day. I am still

moved today to hear about how that day taught her children a lesson in compassion, a lesson in humanity, and a lesson in acceptance of us all.

As the soul of our Nation continues to be tested, I hope the legislation before us—the Great American Outdoors Act—might somehow provide similar opportunities for others. In fact, I challenge all of us to make sure that it does just that.

Most importantly, I also sincerely hope we will soon fulfill at least two other longstanding promises—for equality and justice—that are critical for the future of this country and our democracy. Our public lands can be part of a greater, multifaceted solution that brings equity and opportunity to all of our committees from sea to shining sea.

In the midst of all the turmoil we face in America today lies opportunity. It is our job to find that opportunity and to work together to move this country, which we love and revere, as imperfect as we are, forward. That is our challenge, and that is our opportunity.

I don't know a lot of Latin, but I do know two words, maybe a few more. My two favorites are these: *Carpe diem*, seize the day. This week we have the opportunity on this floor to seize the day. Right over your head where you are sitting are some other Latin words: *e pluribus unum*—from many, one. That is what this country is all about. I think this legislation—maybe not something we would have thought of—can actually help make those words not just Latin words carved in stone but a reality.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. LOEFFLER). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GARDNER. Madam President, thank you to my colleagues last night for an incredibly strong vote, 80 to 17, on the motion to proceed to this debate on the Great American Outdoors Act. We have a lot of work ahead of us this week and obviously a lot more debate to take place. But one thing is certain, we have taken the first step toward a historic bill that protects our public lands, that enhances the incredible work that our national parks do and the policies and goals and ideas they represent around this great Nation.

The Great American Outdoors Act combines two long-held values of both our national parks and the Nation's crown jewel conservation program, the Land and Water Conservation Fund. The Restore Our Parks Act, of course, establishes a fund to set aside dollars to catch up with our backlog of projects that needs to be done, the de-

ferred maintenance backlog in our national parks. It sets up about a \$1.9 billion a year fund to work on roads and visitor centers and the resources that are being loved to death at parks across the country.

It is beyond just parks, of course. It also funds our Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, now headquartered in Grand Junction, CO, and our Fish and Wildlife Service properties, as well as the Bureau of Indian Education.

This act will create jobs; it will create opportunities; but most importantly, it will enhance the resources that this country loves for generations to come.

The second part, of course, of the Great American Outdoors Act is the Land and Water Conservation Fund. You can see here, the monument, the Great Sand Dunes National Park. This one right here shows the Land and Water Conservation Fund along the scenic San Juan Byway.

This is an incredible opportunity for us to preserve the Land and Water Conservation Fund, make it permanently authorized, as we have done through the John D. Dingell Conservation Act, but also permanently fund it through the Great American Outdoors Act. This is a great opportunity for us to fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

That bill that permanently authorized the Land and Water Conservation Fund passed 92 to 8. Last night, the cloture on the motion to proceed passed 80 to 17. This is not a red or blue issue. This is not a left or right issue. This is not a Republican or Democratic issue. This is an American people issue, an idea the American people instituted in this country centuries ago and, in the case of our Forest Service, a century ago—over a century ago. The opportunities to protect our public lands is significant this week, historic this week, one of the greatest conservation achievements that this Congress will have had in decades.

I want to turn to a little bit of the work that we have done in Colorado with the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This is an incredibly important opportunity for us because not only will it help with our most precious places, but it also helps provide access to land that we already have, owned by the American people, public lands that are already held by the American people, but we have no way to access them.

In fact, it is estimated that we have an area the size of Rocky Mountain National Park. Rocky Mountain National Park is the third most heavily visited park in the country. We have an area of land the size of Rocky Mountain National Park that is held by the public. It is owned by the public, but they can't get to it. They have no access to it.

So the Land and Water Conservation Fund is a tool that can be used to provide access to those lands for hunting,

for fishing, for hiking, for recreating. And if you look at that economy, if you look at what it means to our State, it is billions and billions of dollars in economic activity. It is hundreds of thousands of jobs in the great State of Colorado. Across this Nation, it is over 5 million jobs. That is the importance of having new access to places to hunt, to fish, to hike, to recreate—those opportunities.

If you go back to the picture of the sand dunes here—I talked a little bit about it last night—we were able to purchase the Baca National Wildlife Refuge, which is a key part of the Great Sand Dunes National Park. It preserved an ecosystem that helps keep the sand dunes in place.

It is important to recognize that this isn't just about protecting the sand dunes. This isn't just about saying "All right, the sand dunes go from point A to point B, and we are going to protect everything in between" because the entire ecosystem in the San Luis Valley plays a role in the formation of the Great Sand Dunes in this particular area, and the way the water is underground creates a charge, basically, that gives into the sand the particulates, and it is what holds the sand in place. Without that water that is underneath the sand dunes, the sand dunes simply blow away because they don't have the static charge, basically, to keep them in place.

So we are able to use the Land and Water Conservation Fund to preserve areas around the sand dunes that preserve that precious resource for the San Luis Valley that keeps the sand from blowing away. As a result, hundreds of thousands of people visit this area of Colorado. They spend money at hotels; they spend money at restaurants; they spend money at the sporting goods shops; and it helps grow the economy.

While it has been closed for a while, it is back open again. People are starting to get back out and to travel and to spend those dollars.

Colorado has benefited from 38 LWCF projects totaling \$281.2 million over the last 50 years at the Great Sand Dunes, the Uncompahgre, over at the Arapaho and Roosevelt, the Gunnison, the Rio Grande, Canyon of the Ancients National Monument, and beyond.

If you look at the list of LWCF projects that have benefited our local communities, it is page after page of ballfields and parks and water projects and recreation opportunities in counties from corner to corner across our great State.

If you dial in a little bit closer to Rocky Mountain National Park—as I mentioned, the third busiest park in the country—Rocky Mountain National Park has about \$84 million—a little over \$84 million—in deferred maintenance backlog. This bill will help overcome that.

We need to rehabilitate the Alpine Visitor Center developed area. The highest paved road in North America is

Trail Ridge Road, going through Rocky Mountain National Park and up to the Alpine Visitor Center, where you have an amazing, expansive opportunity to learn and to recreate. We need to resurface Beaver Meadows Road, to improve the visitor safety and visitor access at several trail heads, to rehabilitate the East Water System and Moraine Park Campground, to construct an emergency operations center—those are the kinds of things that we continue to work on at Rocky Mountain National Park.

At Mesa Verde—now, not everybody has been to Mesa Verde National Park, but think about this: It was established in 1906, well over 100 years ago, to preserve and interpret the archeological heritage of the ancestral Pueblo people, who made it their home for over 700 years—from 600 to 1,300 current events.

Today, the park protects nearly 5,000 known archeological sites—5,000 archeological sites—and 600 cliff dwellings, some of the most notable and best preserved dwellings in the United States. We have to continue our work. There is \$76 million in backlog at Mesa Verde Park alone; Black Canyon of the Gunnison, nearly \$8 million in backlog; Great Sand Dunes National Park, over \$8 million in backlog. We know we have additional Land and Water Conservation Fund efforts that we could protect, preserve, and promote with the passage of this bill.

I am just going to—and I know we are going to have more conversations today—talk about the economic benefit of this. In March, as the first waves of coronavirus started to pose the economic impact that we are dealing with today, some of the very first places hit in terms of economic impact were the Western Slope areas of Colorado—areas that had their ski season shut down months early, areas that had hotels empty and restaurants closed months earlier than they otherwise would have.

Of course, now we are into the summer season, and the summer recreation season has expanded dramatically, thanks to the bipartisan work the Congress has done over the past several years. Now those restaurants see fewer numbers and hotels see fewer numbers because it is now affecting the summer recreation season.

This bill—the Great American Outdoors Act—comes at a time to provide new jobs to those communities that have lost jobs. In fact, it is estimated that we will create over 100,000 jobs in just the parks part of this legislation alone; that for every \$1 million we spend in Land and Water Conservation Fund and outdoor recreation, we are going to create between 16 and 30 jobs; that it supports the creation of between 16 and 30 jobs for every \$1 million spent, at a time when America needs it most.

We have a chance to pass a bill—the Great American Outdoors Act—to create jobs, to create economic oppor-

tunity, to create the hope we need in communities across this country that have spent the last 3 months not in the great outdoors but in the great indoors, and they are ready to get back to life. There is no greater life than the opportunity to get out and enjoy the blessings of God's labor.

I want to thank my colleague JOE MANCHIN of West Virginia, my colleague STEVE DAINES from Montana for the great work they have done to get this bill to the floor this week.

Obviously, Senator PORTMAN and Senator WARNER and Senators ALEXANDER and KING and Senators HEINRICH and CANTWELL have played an incredible role.

We have a lot more votes this week, and I hope my colleagues will continue to support this opportunity to grow our economy, protect the outdoors, and make this beautiful part of our country last for generations more.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. TESTER. Madam President, I rise today in support of the Great American Outdoors Act. After yesterday's vote, where we voted to move to debate this bill at an 80-17 margin, it felt good.

It felt good because some of us have been fighting this fight to fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund, in particular, for more than a decade.

It is a program that Senator UDALL explained yesterday that has worked out so very, very well since his dad introduced it back in the sixties.

But the Great American Outdoors Act does more than just permanently fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which is a huge accomplishment in and of itself. It also puts money into our Park Service and areas around our parks that are so important for this country. Really, the park system is one of the jewels of this Nation.

President Teddy Roosevelt was truly a visionary. At a time when there were plenty of wild places in this great Nation, he had the good sense to preserve some of them for future generations because he knew they would not be around forever.

Quite frankly, the National Park System encompasses 419 parks, more than 84 million acres, including two crown jewels in Montana—Yellowstone and Glacier National Park. These are places where Americans come together and experience the scale of America's natural beauty.

However, I will tell you, in recent years we—the Congress—have not lived up to President Roosevelt's legacy, and our parks have been left to fall in disrepair. Even as we have seen record numbers of visitors each year, the U.S. Congress has failed to make parks a priority and even make investments in them.

So the Great American Outdoors Act will go a long way to correcting Congress's neglect. In fact, it invests

\$9.5 billion in deferred maintenance on public lands across our country. Those are not only our national parks, but the areas around our national parks, preserving the legacy of America's great outdoors for generations to come.

While this is very, very important—this investment in our national park system, the first part of this legislation—we also need to know that we have places in this country, ecosystems in this country that will not be around for future generations if we don't preserve them today, and that is where the Land and Water Conservation Fund comes in.

The LWCF is the most important conservation tool we have at the Federal level. Nothing else comes close to it. It was founded five decades ago, and Montanans have used about \$540 million of this fund to increase outdoor opportunities on our public lands around our State.

We have used it to preserve tens of thousands of acres of world class elk habitat in central Montana. It has been an essential driver of Montana's growing \$7-billion-a-year outdoor recreation economy. And it has established city parks and open spaces in our more urban communities in Montana.

The best of it all is it doesn't cost the taxpayers a dime because the Land and Water Conservation Fund, as it was set up, was to take money from offshore oil and gas revenue. Well, that hasn't worked out so well, so today we are just saying that it is going to be funded, and it is going to be funded permanently into the future.

The LWCF is a no-brainer. It has overwhelming benefits for States in which investments are made for pennies on the dollar. We are receiving jobs, and we are receiving quality of life. We are receiving the ability to go out and hunt and fish and hike on our public lands.

Unlike any other country in the world, we have these areas where you don't have to be a millionaire to be able to go out and enjoy the outdoors. But these victories did not happen magically overnight. The fact is, we worked long and hard with local conservation groups and public land enthusiasts around the country to build support where it never existed before, and our years of work finally broke the dam earlier this year when President Trump and Senator MCCONNELL reversed their opposition to this legislation because of overwhelming bipartisan momentum that we had built on the ground. I welcome their change of heart, and I know it didn't come easy.

There are so many Montanans and folks around the country I want to thank for putting in the work and bringing my colleagues from darkness to light. Your work has inspired me and inspires future generations that are going to benefit from your selfless efforts.

I was at home last night, and I got a text message from one of those folks that said: Thank you. Thank you for

your hard work for the last 13 years on LWCF. I sent him back a text that said: I don't deserve the thank you. You do because, quite frankly, there have been folks that have been working on this much longer than I.

But now, since the vote yesterday, the clock is ticking. Every day we are losing ecosystems in this country, and because of our tardiness in not fully funding the Land and Water Conservation Fund, we have lost plenty of those ecosystems over the last 10 years, and we will lose even more if we don't get this funding.

The future of our Nation's wild places hang in the balance, and we have something to do about it this week. We can fix it. So I would urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote yes on the Great American Outdoors Act so that we can preserve our public lands for future generations, for our kids and our grandkids, just as that visionary President Teddy Roosevelt did for us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. DAINES. Madam President, this month will forever mark a historic moment for conservation across this Nation when the U.S. Senate votes on one of the most important conservation bills in decades.

The Great American Outdoors Act isn't just about tomorrow, next week, or even next year. This is a bipartisan bill about the future of our children and grandchildren, about legacy, about their ability to enjoy and access our great outdoors and our public lands.

Standing here today, I can tell you there aren't too many issues, unfortunately, that bring both Republicans and Democrats together, but protecting our public lands for future generations is something that brings us all here together.

Just yesterday, we saw a major bipartisan step forward to getting this bill across the finish line—an 80-to-17 vote to move forward with this important bill.

Today, I am joining my Senate colleagues on both sides of the aisle to share how important it is that we pass the Great American Outdoors Act as soon as possible.

Many may ask: Well, how is it, then, that we have finally built enough bipartisan momentum to get this across the finish line? Well, over a year and a half ago, my colleagues and I passed a historic bipartisan public lands package that permanently authorized the Land and Water Conservation Fund—a critical conservation program in Montana and across the country.

In fact, as I am standing here, I am looking across the Chamber at the ranking member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Senator JOE MANCHIN of West Virginia. This is what it is all about in Washington. This is what should be happening more and more. When Senators who sit on opposite sides of the Senate Chamber

because of the way we sit, with Democrats on one side, Republicans on the other—here we are together. We are not fighting each other right now. We are talking about how we are going to come together and pass this.

This is a great moment for our Nation—a time when we need to come together—and, once again, it is public lands that are pulling us together instead of dividing us.

Back in February, just a few months ago, I sat down in the Roosevelt Room with Senator GARDNER, Leader MCCONNELL, and President Trump to see what it would take to get full, mandatory funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund and how we can fix this maintenance backlog, which is plaguing our national parks and our public lands, across the finish line.

In fact, I shared several of Montana's Land and Water Conservation Fund funded projects and shared how vital this funding is for Montana and those who visit. Seventy percent of our fishing accesses in Montana are funded by LWCF.

The President listened. I remember he sat back in his chair. He commented how beautiful the landscapes were that he saw in these pictures. He said that we need to get this across the finish line, and he said that he would sign it into law as soon as we did so.

Protecting and preserving our public lands play a direct role in our Montana way of life. In fact, this picture is of the Yellowstone River. It is not far from Chico. I remember as a kid, back in the sixties, having church potlucks at Chico.

I remember in 1979 I took the family Griswold station wagon, including the brown veneer on the side of it—wood veneer—with several of my high school classmates. That is where we had our homecoming dance dinner, at Chico, just a few miles from where this picture was taken.

I have spent countless days hiking the Beartooth Wilderness area, fishing the Gallatin and the Yellowstone, shown here, enjoying all of Montana's great outdoors in every corner of our State with my sweet wife Cindy, our four children, and our dogs Ruby and Reagan.

In fact, take a look at some of these photos. These are photos I have taken on my phone in some of Montana's public lands. That is Ruby, and there is Reagan. This was up in the Beartooth Wilderness area a few years ago.

In fact, I have another picture here, one of Ruby. We like to take our dogs along because this is wild country. This is country where there are a lot of grizzly bears, and having your dog along oftentimes can be a good deterrent, along with some bear spray.

There is Ruby up at what is called the Mount Villard Spires. In fact, Granite Peak, the highest point in Montana, was one of the last summited high points in the lower 48 when it was climbed. Granite Peak is just around the corner. I summited that back during my college years.

I can tell you, when I talk about public lands and protecting them and making sure we preserve that for generations to come, this is not some kind of theoretical discussion. This something that I live and breathe personally. During the August recess, when we get to leave this town, when it is hot and humid in DC, I get to be up in the wilderness areas of Montana—we do that every August—where the area is crisp, the air is clean.

That is why, as Montana's voice in the U.S. Senate, I am standing here today, fighting to bring this vote to the floor and to make the Great American Outdoors Act a reality.

Many folks may not understand the importance of the Land and Water Conservation Fund and what it means for Montana and States across our country. Let's go over a few important facts.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is critical for public access to public lands. As an avid outdoorsman, a hunter, and a fly fisherman, I understand the importance of our public lands. This program helps connect trails. It funds over 70 percent of Montana's fishing access, and it does much more than that. The Land and Water Conservation Fund provides certainty to land managers, sportsmen, and conservation groups.

The Land and Water Conservation money invests in Montana's outdoor economy, and it helps create jobs in our rural and gateway communities. Let me tell you something. They are struggling right now because our national parks were closed for too long, and they need this boost by getting this passed.

Speaking of the outdoor recreation economy, Montana contributes over \$7 billion and supports 71,000 jobs in Montana alone. In fact, 81 percent of Montanans participate in outdoor recreation every year—81 percent. In fact, every \$1 million invested in the Land and Water Conservation Fund creates between 16 and 30 jobs.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund costs the taxpayers nothing. Let me say that again. It costs the taxpayers nothing, and it promotes energy development. Now, here is the balance we need in our Nation: to continue to develop energy independence and global energy dominance by developing American natural resources, and at the same time the revenues coming off of there are used for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Here is the balance between the two: promoting natural resource development and promoting conservation. This program is primarily funded by oil and gas revenue, and it makes conservation inextricably linked to a strong energy sector, which means the Land and Water Conservation money is already paid for.

Through the Forest Legacy side of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, we will see the promotion of working forests to get our mills back up and running and help support and

create good-paying timber jobs. It will do a much better job of managing our national forests because we will thin them and reduce the risk of wildfires. Perhaps you may have heard otherwise, but this program actually helps promote better land management.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund acts as an important tool for land managers and agencies to address checkerboard land ownership. I decided today to bring pictures of the beautiful landscapes in Montana. I could have gotten a little more technical and showed the checkerboard nature of land ownership in a place like Montana and why we need LWCF to provide better access to our public lands. Because we have 1.5 million acres of Federal land in Montana that is landlocked, Montana directly benefits from the Land and Water Conservation Fund projects that work to consolidate land ownership. You will have a private end holding, you will have a State piece, and another Federal piece in this checkerboard nature, and by consolidating it and working with willing sellers, we can make the overall landscape management easier for agencies and private landowners and provide better access.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund supports locally driven solutions from the ground up. These are collaborative projects that have local support. The LWCF is authorized at \$900 million annually. However, we aren't seeing nearly that much appropriated from that fund every year. In fact, only twice, since it was enacted going back to 1964, have we seen funding levels at \$900 million, and that was the original congressional intent.

Let's be clear. What we are doing here by passing this bill is bringing it back to what Congress intended when it was first originated back in the midsixties. Mandatory funding for the Great American Outdoors Act would create certainty for land managers that the full \$900 million goes toward this program every year moving forward. It is so important because some of these complex checkerboard land ownership structures take many years to sort out. Now we have certainty.

If there is someplace with a lot of uncertainty, it is the U.S. Congress. This removes one of those uncertainties from Congress going forward. We must not forget about the other critical aspect of the Great American Outdoors Act: addressing the maintenance backlog facing our national parks, our forests, and our public lands. We are seeing record levels of visitation in our public lands.

As I think about our national parks, I call them our office of first impression. I believe they are what set us apart from the rest of the world. People come from all over the world to see our national parks. They are unique, and it is part of the amazing American experience.

With this increased visitation every year, our park infrastructure has inevi-

tably experienced a lot of wear and tear. We are fraying a lot on the edges. While this is a good indicator that folks around the world love to enjoy our parks in Montana, we must address the maintenance backlog to ensure that folks continue to come and enjoy what we refer to in Montana as the "Last Best Place." If you look at some of these pictures, I think you might agree with me.

Today, there is nearly \$20 billion in maintenance backlog on our public lands, forests, wildlife refuges, and parks, and \$12 billion of that is for our national parks, including \$700 million in Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks and over \$34 million in Montana's smaller national parks.

Addressing this \$12 billion backlog through the Great American Outdoors Act will play a vital role in getting our national parks back on track. This will create jobs, support our gateway and rural communities, and enhance visitor experience and safety.

The restoration of our national parks could generate over 100,000 additional jobs at a time when our economy needs that kind of boost. While this was an issue we have been working on for years with Members on both sides of this infamous aisle, this is needed maybe now more than ever.

Montanans are raised to love and respect the outdoors. Only once in a great while does such a historic piece of conservation legislation come along—perhaps once every 50 years. It is essential to protect and maintain access to these lands for future generations.

It is my highest honor to serve the people of Montana in the U.S. Senate. I encourage my colleagues to join us in supporting this great piece of legislation, one that has helped bring a divided government together.

I believe it is a conservative principle to conserve, and I will always continue fighting for that principle. I know I and my colleagues here today are ready to get this done. Montanans know what it takes to practice conservative principles and work to conserve their public lands. Now it is time for Congress to come together in a bipartisan way and support the Great American Outdoors Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. MANCHIN. Madam President, I thank my colleague Senator DAINES from Montana and all my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans. Everyone has been so excited about getting up and showing pictures of their beautiful State. All of us—it is the United States of America—every one of us has something to be proud of and show off, and the LWCF and restore our historic parks bills will protect each and every one of them.

I have been in the Senate for almost 10 years. I have not seen any piece of legislation that has brought us together with more enthusiasm than this

piece of legislation, the Great American Outdoors Act, because the entire Nation benefits from it. Whether it be in West Virginia, Colorado, or Montana, wherever it may be, our outdoor resources is something that all of my colleagues can enjoy because we all can visit and enjoy the great American outdoors, if you will.

The strong support for the Great American Outdoors Act is a testament of the importance of this legislation and what it does. We have never had a financial recovery, an economic recovery without infrastructure investments in spending. We don't have a better piece of legislation that does this. It is a win-win all the way around.

More than 150,000 jobs will be created by this bill. I think every county in America—I have 55 counties in West Virginia. Every county in West Virginia, basically, is receiving some sort of help from the LWCF. We have all been greatly impacted by this.

Today, I want to talk about the impact that the Land and Water Conservation Fund has had on my home State of West Virginia. To date, 54 of the 55 counties have benefited, as I said, from the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It is responsible for some of our most cherished outdoor spaces in West Virginia. In fact, since 1965, \$243 million has been spent to enhance recreation and conservation in the Mountain State alone.

The LWCF has supported projects at Canaan Valley National Wildlife Refuge, Gauley River National Recreation Area, New River Gorge—and this is the New River Gorge. This is the New River. If you are in the eastern part of the United States and you haven't floated on the New River or the Gauley, you are missing a great opportunity. The scenery is unbelievable, and floating through the rapids is something special. To float through there is an experience. I welcome and recommend everyone to come visit at least once in your life the wild and wonderful West Virginia on the New River and the Gauley River. The Land and Water Conservation Fund has also helped towns like Marlinton, WV. Mayor Sam Felton was able to turn a vacant lot into the Discovery Junction, a multipurpose community gathering space, with the help of \$86,000 from LWCF.

The fund is also important for our hunting community. Hunting is a way of life. It is part of our culture. It is a tradition that we all cherish and value. The Great American Outdoors Act will increase access to all Federal lands for hunting and fishing all across the country. A lack of access to Federal inholdings is a problem, and I know this has frustrated sportsmen for years.

As the Congressman from Montana has said, over 1.5 million acres is owned in his State by the Federal Government, but all of it doesn't have access. We are able to provide access now with the funding that it will take from this legislation.

Another thing that is very important that has been mentioned, LWCF does not use one iota of taxpayer dollars. This is basically coming off of the royalties of our offshore oil and gas revenues.

I want to mention also that we have some of our Senators whom we tried to accommodate in this piece of legislation. There are a few of the Senators whom I want to make a public commitment that I will work, as ranking member on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, to do everything I can to make sure we understand the needs of the coastal States and the restoration and protection of our coastal States as it is impacted by the changing environment. My commitment to them is I will work diligently with my Southern States and also my Northern States for all of my coastal States. The Senator from Rhode Island has my commitment, and the Senator from Louisiana has my commitment. We will work to make sure they have the needed funds it takes to protect their coastline and all the work that they have done and all the assets that they have contributed to our great country and the value, as far as in their coastal States. We are going to make sure that during the committee I will do everything I can to make sure we have the proper hearings and proper attention for the changes that need to be made. We were unable to put that in this piece of legislation, but I am committed to help work through that, and I will do that.

Because Federal lands are surrounded by private lands, they can be essentially inaccessible, and we have to make sure we have access. Hunting in West Virginia is a time-honored tradition. As I have said, I have been a hunter my entire life, and I look forward to opening day in hunting season each year for all different types of game. I also enjoy fishing immensely. I don't think I have a better day than when I am on the river or I am in the river walking the streams for the trout that we have plentiful amounts of. It is something I have handed down to my children, my son, and my grandson. They all enjoy it. With this bill, we are going to be able to pass on this legacy.

When you think about spending time in the U.S. Senate, most of us have been in public life for some time in other aspects. I have been honored to serve in the State legislature as a member of the house and member of the State senate, and secretary of state and Governor of my great State, and now representing them in the U.S. Senate. You want to leave a legacy, so you keep thinking what can I do that will really make an impact on future generations. I can't think that there is anything we can do that is going to be more impactful than what we are doing today, working on this piece of legislation, the Great American Outdoors Act, to be able to enjoy the great national parks that we have throughout this country, to be able to take your

family and have a family outing, and also the history that goes with it and who we are.

If we don't know where we come from, you don't know where you are going, and the history we have in America is pretty special. Our national parks represent that. Also, to have the access to the beautiful outdoors and the wonderful nature that we have with the LWCF funding, the \$900 million a year, that is a legacy I am proud of. I am proud that my children and my grandchildren and future generations would say that, hey, part of my family was involved in this. We worked this hard. We worked together—and to see Democrats and Republicans in the most troubling time our country has faced in many decades come together enthusiastically, being able to speak and enjoy being with each other and talking about how we can get more of our colleagues involved and having a vote that we had last night, a vote of 80 votes.

I see the Senator from Tennessee who has worked so hard on our national parks and has one of the most beautiful national parks in his State that I am proud of. I just can't tell you how much I think this piece of legislation means to all of us—100 Senators—in this most challenging time that we have in our country right now.

West Virginia has approximately \$62 million in deferred maintenance just for our little national park areas alone. This includes crumbling roads, bridges, outdated wastewater plants, electrical systems, and deteriorating monuments, which I know we are going to be able to start repairing. On average, 1.6 million visitors enjoy our beautiful national parks in West Virginia every year. From New River Gorge National River to Harpers Ferry National Historical Park, visitors to our national parks generate \$73 million from the surrounding communities. This act, the Great American Outdoors Act, will ensure our national parks, forests, and other Federal lands are well taken care of and remain accessible for everyone to enjoy.

West Virginians take great pride in our great outdoor playgrounds. We invite all of you—all of you—to come to wild and wonderful West Virginia and enjoy everything we have to offer. We thank you so much. I thank my staff and the staff of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, of which I am the ranking member, for working tirelessly through the pandemic and through the virus to make sure we are able to have a piece of legislation that generations of Americans will be able to enjoy.

I yield the floor.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, while he is on the floor, I congratulate the Senator from West Virginia for his leadership. Sometimes he says too many cooks spoil the pot or whatever the phrase is. There could be too many

cooks but not in this case. Senator MANCHIN, because of his senior leadership on the Energy Committee and on this bill, has been really a bulwark in bringing it to this point. I thank him for that. He has been excellent about including all sorts of us in the bill.

We have an unusual assortment of U.S. Senators, outside sportsmen groups, conservation groups, the President of the United States, and all of the former Secretaries of the Department of the Interior from Babbitt to Zinke, someone said, going alphabetically—we all support this bill that came up last night with 80 different votes.

Among those who deserve a lot of credit is another Member of the U.S. Senate who is also on the floor right now, Mr. WARNER from Virginia. He became interested in this bill as soon as anyone. He may have been the first one to put his toe in the water. He and Senator PORTMAN from Ohio, they formed a very strong team to bring this bill forward.

Since then, Senators DAINES, GARDNER, HEINRICH, and KING all have joined in, and then Senators MANCHIN and GARDNER, especially, have added the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I thank all of them for their leadership.

I will speak just briefly about what we call the Great American Outdoors bill, and I think it helps first to say what we are talking about. We are talking about the Chilhowee campground on Chilhowee Mountain at the edge of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park in Tennessee. It was closed for 2 or 3 years. Why? Because the sewage system didn't work. So 500 families who normally would use that campground in the summer—go up there and have this majestic view of the highest mountains in the Eastern United States—didn't have that possibility.

The Great Smoky Mountains has about 12 million visitors a year. That is three or four times as many as Yellowstone does or any of the western parks because it is in the East. It has \$224 million of deferred maintenance like that campground. Its annual budget is \$20 million a year. So you don't have to have gone too far in mathematics in the Maryville City School system to understand that it will probably take 15, 20, 25 years, or never to be able to get rid of the deferred maintenance in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park, our most visited national park.

Now, that is a massive disappointment to people who consider our national parks as our greatest treasures, to go there and find a campground closed, a bathroom that doesn't work, a bridge that is closed, a road with a pothole, a trail that is worn out, and visitor centers that are dilapidated, as they are in some of our centers around the country. This is what we are talking about.

This is what we are talking about. We are talking about deferred maintenance, things that are broken and

don't work and interfere with the ability of the American people to go outdoors. Of all the times in our recent history when people would like to go outdoors, it would be right now, just to get out of the house and get away. Of all the times when we need some extra jobs, it would be right now, when we have 14 percent of the people in Tennessee out of work. Some of them could go to work on the roads and the bridges and the trails and the potholes and the sewage systems and the other things that need to be fixed, if we had the money.

So that is the first thing this bill is about. It is about the deferred maintenance in the national parks—but not just in the national parks. With President Trump's enthusiastic support, we have added to the bill, as it has made its way through the Senate, other public lands; for example, the Fish and Wildlife Service lands, the U.S. Forest Service lands, the Bureau of Land Management lands, and the Bureau of Indian Education schools. There are lots of Indian schools that are rundown and need to be fixed.

All of those are part of this bill, which is why, among the 800 organizations—800 outside groups—who have called all of us and asked us to vote last night, among the most enthusiastic are the fishermen and the sportsmen—the Ducks Unlimited, headquartered in Memphis. They are really for this bill because we want to use the public lands. We want them preserved. Fishermen want access to their streams. Tourists want to be able to drive to the top of Newfound Gap in the Great Smoky Mountains or to see the Grand Canyon or to visit Pearl Harbor or to walk on the National Mall. All of these are part of our deferred maintenance problem.

So there are two parts to the bill. The first is the Land and Water Conservation Fund. Now, this is a fund that was created in 1964. It was a pretty good idea, I have always thought. You take an environmental burden—drilling offshore for oil and gas—and you create an environmental benefit—take some of the money and use it to buy treasured lands.

Senator DAINES of Montana points out that 80 percent of the access to good fishing in Montana comes with funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. So for 64 years we have had some money come through Congress for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, but—the problem is—not all of the money that Congress intended, because in 1964 Congress said, Set aside a certain amount of money, about \$900 million, for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, put it in the Treasury, and then spend it for this purpose: half to the States for their land acquisition and half to the Federal Government. But Congress didn't ever appropriate all that money.

We took that back up in 1985 and 1986 with President Reagan's Commission on Americans Outdoors, which I

chaired and Gil Grosvenor from the National Geographic was the cochairman.

The No. 1 recommendation for President Reagan's Commission on Americans Outdoors was to permanently fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund. This bill does that. We permanently authorized it earlier in this Congress. This year we will permanently fund it.

The second part is to restore our parks and our public lands. In that case, as I just described, whether it is the national parks or the fishing or the access roads or the bridges or other rundown and worn-out trails or buildings or sewage systems, at the rate we are going, it will take about 15 to 20 years, maybe longer—maybe never—to finish all that deferred maintenance, but, with this bill, we should reduce that substantially.

The idea is to take about up to \$14 billion over 5 years and use it to pay for deferred maintenance. Now, how do we pay for that? Well, we pay for it with real money. We pay for it with earnings from energy exploration on Federal lands.

Now, this is not a new concept. As I mentioned, the Land and Water Conservation Fund put that into law in 1964: environmental burden, environmental benefit. It is also not a new concept for all the coastal States in our country because we take money—I think it is 27 percent of the money we get from drilling just off the coastal States—and we give it to those States.

We also take some money from drilling in what we call an area beyond the 3-mile limit for southern States and give them 37 percent of that money. We also take some money from drilling, say, in Wyoming and give Wyoming 50 percent of that money—or in Alaska, 90 percent of that money.

The difference is, we do all of that before we give the rest to the Treasury. So the idea that we are spending real money from energy drilling in a new and different way is stretching it a little bit because we already spend a lot of money that we earn from energy exploration on Federal lands by giving it to States before we give the rest of it to the Treasury. The difference here is, after we give the rest of it to the Treasury, we are going to take half of that for 5 years and use it for deferred maintenance. Senator PORTMAN, who used to be Director of the Office of Management and Budget, calls it using real money to reduce an unpaid debt.

Now, it is absolutely true that the way the Congressional Budget Office looks at that, it is not offset. But there is a difference of opinion here. President Trump looks at it in a different way. He thinks it is real money for deferred maintenance. The Office of Management and Budget disagrees with the Congressional Budget Office. They approve this spending. The President's budget includes this spending.

We are spending, as I said earlier, money that we already—the same kind of money we spend that we give to

States before we give it to the Federal Government.

So, if I am walking down Broadway in Maryville, TN, where I am from, and I am trying to say to them “Where does this come from?” we would say that we use real money. We use money from energy exploration on Federal lands. We are going to use it for 5 years—in the case of everything but the Land and Water Conservation Fund for 5 years. If we don't have the money, we don't spend it. If we do have the money, we do spend it.

As a result of that, we are going to be able to fix those broken bridges, those sewage systems, those dilapidated visitor centers, those roads with potholes, those trails that are worn out. Instead of maybe never fixing them or doing them at a rate of 20 or 25 years, we will be able to cut in half that deferred maintenance backlog and reduce substantially the time it takes to make these public lands the kinds of lands that all of us expect when we go to visit.

So I am delighted to be in full support of this. I thank Senator WARNER, Senator PORTMAN, and all the others who have worked so hard on it. I hope that the vote we had last night, with 80 Senators of both parties in support of moving ahead with the bill, signals that, as we go through the other procedural efforts this week, we will have significant bipartisan support, send it to the House where an identical bill is being introduced, and send it to the President.

President Trump is fully in support of it. In fact, without him and his Office of Management and Budget, we wouldn't have a chance to do it.

More than 2½ years ago, Secretary Zinke, a big fellow from Montana who was the Interior Secretary, came down to Tennessee and asked me if I would get involved in this because it was so important. He said that he had talked to Mick Mulvaney, who was then in the Office of Management and Budget, and to the President and they wanted it done.

So I got involved. I found myself in pretty good company with Senator WARNER and a lot of other folks, and here we are today. So I hope we have great success with this bill. I know the people of Tennessee are looking forward to it.

I would be remiss if I didn't point out—I pointed out that, with the Smokies, our backlog is about \$224 million, and our annual budget is about \$20 million, so we will never get the backlog fixed if we don't pass a bill like this or this bill.

The same applies to other public lands in our State. The Cherokee National Forest, which is the largest piece of public land in Tennessee, will get help with their \$27 million maintenance backlog to make sure their access roads and trails are kept open for 3 million visitors each year. That is about as many visitors as many of our most popular western parks have.

The Tennessee National Wildlife Refuge will get help with their \$8.4 million maintenance backlog to make sure the hunters and fishers can safely use the boat ramps and the boat docks.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRUZ). The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, the timing has worked out pretty well. It is great to be able to speak on this piece of legislation after my friend the Senator from Tennessee has just completed speaking.

We were hearing some, I think, classic legislating coming from Senator ALEXANDER. He was very generous in his compliments to Senator MANCHIN, to me, to Senator PORTMAN, to Senator DAINES, and to Senator GARDNER, but we all know that we wouldn't be here on the cusp of passing the most significant piece of environmental outdoor lands legislation in a generation or, for that matter, in 50 years if it hadn't been for the leadership of Senator ALEXANDER from Tennessee.

So many of us who have had an opportunity to work with him and become friends with him over his years in the Senate have tried to emulate him at times and listen to him all the time. He is a Senator I wish we had more of in this Senate, who says more often than not: Let's not worry about who gets the credit; let's just see if we can get some things done.

There were two pieces of legislation that had to come together. There was the challenge of getting the administration in, the challenge that we had, at one point, too many Democrats and maybe not enough Republicans, and it was Senator ALEXANDER who kind of guided us through this—at least from the parks side—3-year journey.

I just want to publicly acknowledge his enormous leadership on this piece of legislation, thank him for his friendship, and thank him for the great work that he has done garnering, as well, the over 800-plus environmental groups that have come to support this legislation. I know that my friend the Senator from Tennessee is not going to stand for reelection, and I know he will have many, many legacy items from his tenure in the Senate, but I believe this Great American Outdoors Act will rank in the top three or top five of his legislative accomplishments in that kind of quiet "Let's not worry about whose name is first on the bill, but let's just get it done" way that is playing out this week, as we saw last night with a remarkable, remarkable 84 votes.

It may not end up with 84 votes on the final passage, but, again, the path to get here has been a fascinating one and one that I have learned from. So I do want to rise to join all of the colleagues I have mentioned and others in support of the Great American Outdoors Act.

I got involved in this issue over 3 years ago. We, in Virginia, are blessed with a lot of great national parks. We

are blessed with a number of historic battlefields and other historic sites. We have some of the parkland roads, the parkways—in Northern Virginia, the George Washington Memorial Parkway that I come to work here in the Capitol on every day, the Blue Ridge Parkway, the Colonial Parkway. We have over \$1.1 billion of that backlog, and this legislation is so critically important.

The legislation, it has been mentioned, represents the most significant investment in our public lands in a generation, and I believe, at this moment in time, something critically important as well: a job creator in our outdoor economy.

The Great American Outdoors Act will provide up to \$9.5 billion over 5 years to address not only the deferred maintenance and backlogs at the National Park Service but other Federal land agencies as well. This is the kind of mastery of Senator ALEXANDER in combining the two pieces of legislation.

The bill also finally provides full and mandatory funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund. It has been a long road getting to this point, but I am thrilled that we are finally at this moment in time on this important, job-creating legislation that is also preserving the legacy that God granted this country in terms of the outdoors, in terms of our history. This is really a gift to our kids, grandkids, and future generations.

Now, many of us have indicated how we got here, and I am going to add my voice as well. Years of chronic underfunding has forced the Park Service to defer maintenance on countless trails, buildings, and historic structures, as well as thousands of miles of roads and bridges.

So today, the National Park Service faces a deferred maintenance backlog of over \$12 billion. As a matter of fact, over half of all Park Service assets are currently in desperate need of repairs.

As I mentioned, in Virginia alone, the deferred maintenance backlog sits at over \$1.1 billion. That means, in Virginia, we trail only the District of Columbia and California in terms of jurisdictions in total backlog.

To address this growing problem in Virginia and across the country, 3 years ago Senator ALEXANDER, Senator PORTMAN, my good friend Senator ANGUS KING, and I introduced the original legislation, the Restore Our Parks Act, which would provide significant funds to the Park Service to reduce its maintenance backlog and utilize unobligated energy resources.

In March, our bill was combined with Senator GARDNER and Senator MANCHIN's LWCF legislation to form the Great American Outdoors Act. This bill on the floor today will provide, as I indicated, up to \$6.65 billion over 5 years to restore and repair our national parks. That is enough to address more than half of the currently deferred maintenance backlog and completely fund the highest priority de-

ferred maintenance projects within the agency.

This represents one of the largest—if not the largest—investments in infrastructure in our national parks in the over 100-year history of the National Park Service.

In addition to preserving our national treasures for future generations to enjoy, this legislation will also create tens of thousands of jobs across the country and provide a positive economic impact for those gateway communities.

The Senator from Tennessee mentioned Chilhowee in Tennessee. We have a Chilhowee in Southwest Virginia as well. Those gateway communities depend on our national parks.

As a matter of fact, a recent study by the National Park Service indicates that the Great American Outdoors Act will actually support over 100,000 jobs and contribute \$17.5 billion in total economic output through this legislation. In Virginia alone, that means over 10,000 jobs could be created by eliminating this maintenance backlog.

Let me give you a few examples that are a more parochial basis of what that will mean in Virginia. Here in the national capital region, the George Washington Memorial Parkway, which is managed by the National Park Service, has over \$700 million in deferred maintenance. As a matter of fact, anyone who travels on that road knows that, north of the Theodore Roosevelt Bridge, we actually had a sinkhole appear in the parkway within the last year—an enormous safety threat as well as a huge inconvenience to the traveling public.

Our legislation would help rebuild this critical transportation route between Virginia, Washington, and Maryland—again, reducing traffic and creating jobs.

I mentioned that in Virginia we are blessed with a number of historic battlefields. The Richmond National Battlefield Park has over \$5 million in deferred maintenance, and the nearby Petersburg National Battlefield has nearly \$9 million in deferred maintenance.

Our legislation would help preserve these important pieces of our heritage while also supporting the local economies. At the Shenandoah National Park, one of the crown jewels of the National Park Service, the maintenance backlog sits at \$90 million.

Our legislation will put people to work on these overdue repairs, including Skyline Drive and stretches of the Appalachian Trail, which are, again, at the heart of Virginia's outdoor tourism industry.

As you head further southwest in Virginia, the Blue Ridge Parkway has accumulated over \$508 million in deferred maintenance needs. That is over \$1 million per mile of the parkway. The Great American Outdoors Act would put Virginians to work on these repairs so that visitors can continue to appreciate the beauty of the Appalachian Highlands in support, again, of the local economy.

I will just give you one final example—the Colonial National Historical Park, which is home to Historic Jamestowne and the Yorktown Battlefield. At this park, containing some of our Nation's most significant sites—beginning our Nation and the birth of our Nation in terms of the revolution—there are deferred maintenance needs totaling over \$433 million.

With this legislation, the wait on these repairs is over. We are going to create jobs and make sure this important part of our history is around for years to come.

In addition to securing these funds for the Park Service and other public lands, the Great American Outdoors Act also provides the full mandatory funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

LWCF is the most important tool the Federal Government and States have to conserve natural areas, water resources, and cultural heritage, and expand recreation opportunities to all communities.

Over the past four decades, Virginia has received over \$360 million in LWCF funding that has been used to preserve critical places in the Commonwealth, like the Rappahannock River Valley and Back Bay National Wildlife Refuge and the Appalachian National Scenic Trail.

With full funding from the LWCF, we will be able to conserve additional critical lands in the Commonwealth and provide more recreational opportunities for Virginians from the coalfields to the Chesapeake Bay and everywhere in between.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support this historic legislation that will help restore our national parks and public lands, create tens of thousands of jobs across the country, and expand recreation opportunities for millions of Americans. This bipartisan piece of legislation, which also has the support of the administration, is legislation whose time has arrived. I look forward to its successful passage later this week.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if my remarks go over the time for the recess at 12:30 that they be allowed to extend beyond that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF CHARLES Q. BROWN

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. President, this is going to be a historic day for the U.S. Senate, as we come to the floor after the recess, after lunch here, to be voting on the confirmation of Gen. Charles Q. Brown, Jr., to be the Chief

of Staff of the U.S. Air Force—Gen. C.Q. Brown. I will be voting for General Brown because he is the right man, at the right time, for this very important job. Let me explain why.

General Brown has an impressive academic record and a sterling record of service to our great Nation and, of course, to the U.S. Air Force. He is a distinguished graduate of the Armed Force Reserve Officer Training Corps, with a bachelor of science degree in civil engineering from Texas Tech—the Presiding Officer might like that—as well as a master's degree in aeronautical science from Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University.

Currently, General Brown is the commanding officer—the four-star general—in charge of Pacific Air Forces, all Pacific Air Forces. Of course, Mr. President, you know that is really important because he is literally on the frontlines in implementing the national defense strategy, which has a focus on great power competition, particularly China, as the pacing threat to our Nation for the next 50 to 100 years. General Brown is in that battle right now, frontlines, every day, in his current billing. That is really important.

Prior to being commander of the Pacific Air Forces, he was the deputy commander of U.S. Central Command for 2 years. He knows all about the national security challenges that we have from that region of the world, which are still very significant—particularly violent extremist organizations, like al-Qaida and ISIS—that continue to threaten the United States.

From 2015 to 2016, he served as the U.S. Air Force's Central Command Combined Force Air Component Commander, where he oversaw the strategic bombing campaigns against ISIS in Iraq and Syria, as well as operations against insurgent groups in Afghanistan.

With a record like that—pretty remarkable—he understands the threats we are currently facing. He understands the big challenges we are seeing over the horizon with regard to China. And he is ready to lead the Air Force to take on those threats as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Secretary of the Air Force, Barbara Barrett, said of General Brown:

He has unmatched strategic vision and operational expertise. His leadership will be instrumental as the service continues to focus on the capabilities and talent we need to implement the National Defense Strategy.

That is the Secretary of the Air Force on Gen. C.Q. Brown.

In my conversations with him, I certainly believe these qualities, these characteristics, the Secretary of the Air Force describes to certainly be true. I have had many good conversations with him on strategy, on strategic basing, including in the Asia-Pacific region, and I am very confident that, again, he is the right person for the right job at this moment.

I also want to mention that he will be the first African-American to serve

as a chief in our military's history. I have known General Brown for some time, but I was actually surprised when I realized this. Colin Powell was Chairman of the Joint Chiefs and did an amazing job, but we have not had an African-American serve as chief in any other services in the history of the United States.

I think that is very important right now. In many ways, this is a historic nomination, particularly, as our country is roiling over the killing of George Floyd and the protests that are taking place—peacefully now, which is great—to demand justice for him and his family, and as we look at some of the challenges we have in our Nation with regard to countering racism across America.

In a very moving video address last week, General Brown recently talked about what is on his mind in terms of some of these challenges. He talks about many of the things that are on his mind, many aspects of his career. It is very powerful. I would recommend that people who care about these issues take a look at that very powerful speech. He said that he was thinking about the conversations his wife of 31 years, Sharene, and his two sons, Sean and Ross, have had on these times recently but, also, the immense responsibility that comes from his historic nomination. He was thinking, of course, about how he could make our country better for others from a national security standpoint and with regard to other issues.

Think about that. That is a tremendous weight for anyone to carry, but I firmly believe that General Brown's shoulders are broad and strong enough to carry this weight.

I am going to be voting enthusiastically yes with regard to the vote we are going to take at 2:15 this afternoon. I want to encourage all of my colleagues to vote yes, to have a 100-to-0 vote for this important, impressive nomination to be the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force.

I yield the floor.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in recess until 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 12:32 p.m., recessed until 2:16 p.m. and reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mrs. CAPITO).

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to consider the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of General Charles Q. Brown, Jr., for appointment as Chief

of Staff, United States Air Force, and appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 9033: to be General.

Thereupon, the Senate proceeded to consider the nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous order, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of General Charles Q. Brown, Jr.?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Maryland (Mr. CARDIN) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote or to change their vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 115 Ex.]

YEAS—98

Alexander	Gillibrand	Portman
Baldwin	Graham	Reed
Barrasso	Grassley	Risch
Bennet	Harris	Roberts
Blackburn	Hassan	Romney
Blumenthal	Hawley	Rosen
Blunt	Heinrich	Rounds
Booker	Hirono	Rubio
Boozman	Hoeven	Sanders
Braun	Hyde-Smith	Sasse
Brown	Inhofe	Schatz
Burr	Johnson	Schumer
Cantwell	Jones	Scott (FL)
Capito	Kaine	Scott (SC)
Carper	Kennedy	Shaheen
Casey	King	Shelby
Cassidy	Klobuchar	Sinema
Collins	Lankford	Smith
Coons	Leahy	Stabenow
Cornyn	Lee	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Loeffler	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Cruz	Menendez	Udall
Daines	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Moran	Warner
Durbin	Murkowski	Warren
Enzi	Murphy	Whitehouse
Ernst	Murray	Wicker
Feinstein	Paul	Wyden
Fischer	Perdue	Young
Gardner	Peters	

NOT VOTING—2

Cardin Markey

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote the yeas are 98, the nays are 0, and the historic nomination of Gen. Charles Q. Brown, Jr., as the U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff is confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

TAXPAYER FIRST ACT OF 2019— MOTION TO PROCEED—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. CAPITO). The Senator from Tennessee.

RACISM

Mr. ALEXANDER. Madam President, U.S. Senator TIM SCOTT, who is an African-American Republican from South Carolina, once told our Bible study that police in his hometown had stopped him several times for being a "Black man in the wrong place" even though, at the time, he was serving as chairman of the Charleston City Council.

During these last few days, I have been thinking a lot about what TIM SCOTT told us, and I wondered how many White Americans know things like that happen—White Americans like me. I wondered how I would feel if I were stopped for being a White man in the wrong place in my hometown, especially if most of the people in the town were Black. Would I feel hurt? Scared? Disillusioned? Angry? Weary? Disappointed? Intimidated? Probably all of those things.

One result of George Floyd's killing is that Black Americans are telling more stories like TIM SCOTT's. A professor of religious studies in Nashville wrote in *The Tennessean* that he carries a licensed firearm with him when he goes for a run. A columnist remembers that, as a 6-year-old, a White woman outside a Dallas gas station restroom said to him: Now, you don't belong here.

Well-educated Black businessmen count the times they have been profiled because of their race. One of my friends in Memphis, who is now vice president of Memphis's largest hospital, told me that when he went to Memphis State in the 1960s, it was clear to him that almost everyone thought that he didn't belong there.

During my lifetime, I have seen profound changes in racial attitudes. In 1958, when I enrolled at Vanderbilt University, I had no Black classmates. African Americans couldn't sit at lunch counters in Nashville. Blacks driving across Tennessee couldn't stay in most motels; they couldn't eat at most restaurants; they couldn't ride at the front of most public buses.

Then, in 1962, in the spring, the Vanderbilt University Board of Trustees changed its policy and admitted Black undergraduate students.

In August of 1963, I remember standing in the back of a huge crowd late that month. I was an intern in the U.S. Department of Justice, and I heard a booming voice—which was Dr. Martin Luther King's voice—say: "I have a dream."

In 1968, I was a Senate aide here, and I remember being in the room, which is today the Republican leader's office, where Senators were around a big table, and Senator Everett Dirksen and then-President Lyndon Johnson were writing the Civil Rights bill.

During the 1980s, I saw Tennessee adopt a Martin Luther King holiday and swear in its first Black supreme court justice. In the 1980s, the University of Tennessee hired its first two Black vice presidents, and it hired its first Black basketball coach who, as a teenager in Alcoa, once sat in the "colored" section at UT football games.

I saw the Voting Rights Act help to elect thousands of African-American public officials, including President Barack Obama and Senator TIM SCOTT. Last week, I asked Senator SCOTT if I could tell the story that he told us privately in the Bible study. He said: Sure. It happened again just last month.

So despite a half century of profound change, an African-American U.S. Senator is stopped again by police for being a Black man in the wrong place in his hometown. So what do we do now? Bringing those who killed George Floyd to justice will help. Dealing firmly with looters who hijack peaceful protests will help. Some new laws and government actions will help, such as criminal justice reform and permanent funding for historically Black colleges that became law in this Congress. It would also help to open schools and colleges in August and to open them safely because a good education is the surest ticket to a better future for minority students, and those students will suffer more from schools being closed.

Benjamin Hooks, the former NAACP president from Memphis—he was the national president of the NAACP; he lived in Memphis. He taught students this. Dr. Hooks said: America is a work in progress. We have come a long way, but we have a long way to go.

That long way to go, I would say, will not be as easy as passing laws. It will take changing behavior. One way to do that could be last week's peaceful protest organized by Nashville teenagers, which was a textbook example of First Amendment citizenship, and it hopefully will encourage more victims of racism to tell their stories and more White Americans to adjust our attitudes.

I am grateful that TIM SCOTT gave me permission to tell his story. Perhaps a good first step to changing attitudes toward racial discrimination would be for each of us who is White to ask ourselves this question: How would I feel if police in my hometown repeatedly stopped me for being a White man or a White woman in the wrong place, especially if most of the other people in the town were Black?

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. BLACKBURN). The Senator from New Mexico.

H.R. 1957

Mr. HEINRICH. Madam President, during these past months, in the midst of a pandemic that has kept most of us inside our homes, Americans have grown to appreciate, in new ways, how critical each moment of fresh air can

be to maintaining both our physical health and our mental well-being.

More people are getting outside than ever before, whether for a quick walk in their local neighborhood park or by seeking solitude on the many public lands held in trust for each and every American citizen. Coming from a State that is blessed with expansive skies and remote open spaces, I am convinced that investing in the future of our parks and our public lands will be a key path for our Nation to recover from the challenges we currently face.

That is why I am so proud that we are coming together this week to bring the Great American Outdoors Act to the Senate floor for a vote. Our bipartisan legislation will permanently and fully fund the Land and Water Conservation Fund and finally dedicate real resources to begin tackling the multibillion dollar infrastructure backlog in our national parks, our national forests, and our wildlife refuges.

If you have spent time enjoying your local parks, trail systems, ballfields or open space in the last 50 years, you have almost certainly experienced the impact of the Land and Water Conservation Fund. In New Mexico, LWCF has been instrumental in protecting some of our most treasured public lands—places like the Valles Caldera National Preserve with its trout streams, its high altitude meadows, and its massive elk herd. I know it is hard to tell, but this is actually me not catching a trout in the Valles Caldera National Preserve, but it is OK because any day in the preserve is a good day.

It also helped us establish the Valle de Oro National Wildlife Refuge in Albuquerque's South Valley, a place where young people will be introduced to nature, many for the first time in a really meaningful way, in a place that is at the heart of the local community now.

It purchased and protected the entirety—the entirety—of Ute Mountain, which is now a centerpiece of the Rio Grande del Norte National Monument. It almost boggles the mind to think about the scale of that, but this entire mountain used to be private, and there was no public access. Today, it is one of the most treasured places in Taos County, a rural county that relies on recreation and fishing and boating and camping to drive its economy.

The Land and Water Conservation Fund is also our most effective tool for opening up public access to our public lands. Just recently, the Land and Water Conservation Fund helped the Bureau of Land Management acquire land parcels that finally opened up public access to the rugged Sabinoso Wilderness in Northeastern New Mexico. This is Sabinoso, with its narrow mesas and spectacular canyon walls, which had previously been completely off limits to the public despite being part of the national wilderness system. It had become entirely surrounded by public land, so there wasn't a legal trail or a legal road to be able to enjoy

this place. Today, that landscape is something that the local community and visitors from afar share on a daily basis.

LWCF also funds recreation areas in neighborhood parks, sports fields, and communities all across our State and all across the Nation.

Last year, I was proud to be part of a successful bipartisan effort here in the Senate to permanently reauthorize LWCF. However, without guaranteed permanent funding, Congress still needs to approve LWCF expenditures each year, year after year after year. This has resulted in us falling far, far short of the \$900 million per year commitment that was originally intended when LWCF was established over five decades ago. Permanently and fully funding LWCF will be a monumental victory for conservation and the places where we all get outside.

It might well be the greatest investment that we can make that will pay off for many generations to come because every \$1 spent on LWCF creates an additional \$4 in economic value just in natural resources, goods, and services. That doesn't account for the long-term growth in the outdoor recreation sector and the tourism industry.

Teddy Roosevelt once said: "Conservation means development as much as it does protection." I believe that this type of investment in conservation is exactly what President Roosevelt meant.

Now, to the second leg of our landmark Great American Outdoors Act: We all know how important it is to rebuild the infrastructure in all of our national parks. You can't enjoy visiting these iconic American places if the bathrooms don't work, if the trails and the campgrounds aren't open, and if the roads are in disrepair. These are places that we are so proud of, that we cherish. From our oldest national parks, like Yellowstone and Yosemite, to our Nation's newest national park—one I am particularly close to—White Sands National Park in New Mexico, they all deserve better.

I am proud that the Great American Outdoors Act also includes dedicated funding to address similar infrastructure needs in our national forests, our wildlife refuges, and our Bureau of Land Management lands. We have also included dedicated funding to address the unacceptable maintenance backlog at schools managed by the Bureau of Indian Education. There are many BIE schools that serve students across Indian country that are in truly dangerous states of disrepair.

Through this legislation, we are finally going to make major progress on providing these students the kinds of safe schools and educational facilities that they truly deserve.

In the wake of our current economic crisis, rebuilding all this critical infrastructure will provide tens of thousands of new jobs across the Nation. It is estimated that just investing in fixing the National Park Service's infra-

structure alone would generate nearly 110,000 new jobs. These investments will also create a lasting heritage that will grow the outdoor recreation economy and provide us all with more opportunities to get outside. We know this can work.

The last time we as a nation faced an economic downturn on the scale of what we are experiencing today, Americans turned to our public lands. At the height of the Great Depression, Franklin Delano Roosevelt understood well that out-of-work Americans were not without worth but, rather, that they could leave an indelible mark on our country.

Now, over the years, I have been lucky to have met many of the men who served in the New Deal's Civilian Conservation Corps, or "CCC boys," as they often referred to themselves as. While most of these men have now passed away, sadly, the trails, the visitor centers, and the other important infrastructure on our public lands that they had so much pride in building almost a century ago continue to serve this Nation.

Throughout our long recovery, we will be a stronger nation if we can provide a new generation of Americans with meaningful opportunities to serve their country and leave their mark. There is so much work we need to do to rebuild our country.

In the midst of a real national reckoning on race over these recent weeks and as we continue to face the most severe economic and public health crises in generations, we should all be thinking about how we can rebuild our country in a way that includes all of us.

I firmly believe that this urgent goal is intertwined in our efforts this week in the Senate to grow opportunities in our great American outdoors. That is because our public lands and outdoor spaces are fundamental to who we are as Americans. They are the places where we can each find a real sense of belonging in this great country of ours. I think we must frankly acknowledge the uncomfortable truth that the outdoors has not always seemed like such a welcoming and accessible place for all Americans. Many of our national parks have a fraught history with the Tribal nations whose ancestral lands they are on. In New Mexico, many of our national forests were established on the very same lands that were deeded as land grants to families by the Spanish Crown.

Our public lands agencies have not always recognized that history, and there remains much more hard work ahead to provide meaningful seats at the table in the management of these landscapes to the communities whose heritage and living cultural ties date back hundreds and, in some cases, even thousands of years on these lands.

We must also recognize that outdoor excursions, which many of us, frankly, just take for granted, are not always within reach for all of us. I grew up exploring the outdoors on my family's

ranch and on surrounding lands, and I strongly believe that just one opportunity to get outside can change a child's whole world. It can inspire a lifetime commitment to conservation and encourage the health benefits that come with an active lifestyle.

Far too many kids don't have access to parks or open spaces. According to the Trust for Public Land, more than 100 million Americans—and that includes 28 million children—do not have access to a park within a 10-minute walk of their home. That number should be zero. Especially during the pandemic, that number should have been zero.

On top of physical accessibility, many children grow up in households where their parents cannot afford a vacation or they may feel rightly unsafe in these spaces, fearing an experience much like that of Christian Cooper in Central Park recently. We are not solving all of these challenges with what we are voting on here this week, but the increased investment in the Great American Outdoors Act will create more outdoor opportunities that I hope will truly benefit all of our Nation's children.

Our public lands are places we should all be able to access regardless of how thick or thin our wallets are, where we grow up, or the color of our skin. To learn about the natural wonders all around us, to really learn about our history by exploring the stories that reside in these places, I don't know of any easy answers to the numerous historic challenges we are facing as a nation today, but I do know that the right answers will come only if they are based on an honest appraisal of our deep-seated history—the good and the bad, the inspiring and the painful.

I believe one of the best ways for kids—really all of us—to learn about that complex history of our country is by visiting our public lands. Let me share just one example. When you visit El Morro National Monument in Western New Mexico, you walk up to a massive sandstone rock wall that dominates the high desert landscape around it. As you approach the cliff face, you begin to clearly see etchings and markings carved into the stone. These inscriptions give physical form to the history of many, many generations of people who have come to our State or called it home. There are petroglyphs from indigenous cultures, and right next to them—in some cases, even carved over them—are signatures of Spanish priests and conquistadors dating back to the late 1500s and early 1600s. There are records left by American homesteading families traveling westward on wagon trains. You can find the names of U.S. Army soldiers, including the strange but true Army Camel Corps that trained nearby in the late 1850s. And, yes, you heard that right, Camel Corps. The military was testing out camels in the New Mexico desert long before they started testing out fighter jets, rockets, and satellites in New Mexico.

When you see all of these names and images left behind on El Morro's Inscription Rock, you begin to appreciate how varied and also how messy the history of just this one place in our Nation is. You begin the process of learning that we have always been a country filled with diverse, resilient people but also a country riddled with conflicts and shortcomings. That is why it is so important to protect our parks and to protect our public lands.

These are the places where new generations of Americans will learn about both our natural and our human history. It is where they will go to find inspiration to chart new paths forward for our great Nation. For all of these reasons, I am so proud that we have come together on this legislation. We can all understand why investing in restoring and expanding opportunities in our parks and public lands has to be part of our national recovery. These are the places where all of us belong.

These are the places where all of us belong. These lands are our lands, and they heal us in a way that few things can.

I think of all the generations of Americans who have cared for these places so my family and I can enjoy them and learn from them today. With this historic legislation, the Great American Outdoors Act, we are going to help do our part to, literally, pay it forward.

We often invoke Teddy Roosevelt around here when working on conservation legislation. That legislation rarely measures up to the level of accomplishment that you see written in the story of his Presidency.

While I am not superstitious, I have to admit that I always visit his bust here in the Capitol just outside this Chamber before an important conservation vote. This bill—this bill—is the first time in my career that we have done something truly on the scale of Teddy Roosevelt's work, and I stand here proud to be a part of it.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, if you were to approach a random person on the street in any city in America today and say: Who is George Floyd, I could all but guarantee you that you would be met with a quick response. They would tell you about their horror at seeing this video of him being killed at the hands of a Minneapolis police officer; that, sadly, he was not the first victim of this type of crime; and that his death has now mobilized Americans of all races, ages, and backgrounds to demand action.

A friend of Mr. Floyd's for more than 35 years said:

Everybody in the world knows who George Floyd is today. Presidents, Kings, and Queens—they know George Floyd.

It is true. His name and face are everywhere. He is the subject of incredible artwork, passionate speeches, and dinner table conversations. He is the reason for marches and demonstrations in the cities from Houston to Minneapolis, to London, to Sydney. And today, after 2 weeks of grieving, the Floyd family will finally lay their beloved brother, father, and friend to rest in his hometown of Houston, TX.

Over the past 2 weeks, I have joined the chorus of voices calling for justice for Mr. Floyd. The first step is underway now that the officers have been charged, but this alone is not enough. Our country has a responsibility to do the best we can to prevent another family from burying their son or daughter as a result of excessive force by a police officer.

People of all races are now actively engaged in a national conversation about the racial injustices that exist in our country—one that is deeply needed and long overdue.

I want to assure the people of Texas that these conversations are happening in the U.S. Senate as well. Our friend and colleague Senator TIM SCOTT, from South Carolina, briefed the Republican conference today on the package of bills he is developing, with help from a group of our Members, to combat the racial injustice that still exists in our country today—particularly, as it applies to law enforcement.

This is a product of discussions that Leader MCCONNELL and I and others have had that would make real and lasting changes in communities across the country. I am proud to be part of the discussion led by Senator SCOTT, and I want to commend both him and the majority leader for their leadership and sense of urgency—one we all feel.

I think the necessary changes begin within our criminal justice system. Despite calls from some to defund or even disband the police, I believe these steps would do far more harm than good. It is not the right answer. Instead, we need to do a top-to-bottom review of our criminal justice system—something that has not happened in more than 50 years.

Senators PETERS, GRAHAM, and I have introduced a bill to create a National Criminal Justice Commission that would do just that. Over the course of 18 months, the Commission would examine our criminal justice system and provide recommendations on specific changes that should be made by Congress.

I have recommended this bill be included in the legislation Senator SCOTT is developing, and I am eager to work with him and all of our colleagues in the coming days in the hope of gaining broad bipartisan support. As we know, the only way things get done around here is with bipartisan support. I can't

think of anything more urgent, at this particular time, than we demonstrate we can come together and rise above our partisan differences and address this very real need.

Of course, there is nothing we can do to reverse what happened in Minneapolis, but there is a lot that can be done to prevent the name of another Black person in America from becoming a trending hashtag. A former classmate of Mr. Floyd's at Jack Yates High School said he always would say: "I'm going to change the world." While this is certainly not the way he or anyone could have fathomed, his story is sure to have a lasting impact on our country's history.

Today, I would like to offer, once again, my condolences to the entire Floyd family for their loss. I had the privilege of speaking with them on the telephone yesterday. Rodney Floyd reminded me that the family was from Houston, TX, and he said: We want Texas-size justice.

I said: Mr. Floyd, you will have it.

In the wake of this tragedy, I hope we can come together and deliver that change. I appreciate Senator SCOTT and Leader MCCONNELL leading the charge in the Senate and look forward to sharing more details of this proposal soon.

PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM

Madam President, on another matter, since the CARES Act was signed into law more than 2 months ago, millions of small businesses—I think 4.5 million businesses—have gotten loans from the Paycheck Protection Program. This program has allowed restaurants, retailers, manufacturers, farmers, and small businesses from virtually every sector of the economy to stay afloat and keep their employees on payroll.

Dr. Nora Walker operates a pulmonary practice in San Antonio—my hometown—which experienced a near stop on patient visits once COVID-19 began to soar in March. Payroll is her largest expense. Without that source of revenue, she and her husband were worried they wouldn't be able to pay the practice's three employees, but then the lifeline came in the form of the PPP loan. They applied for a \$26,000 loan, and they received the funds 2 weeks later. Because of that funding, these three employees could stay on the payroll as Dr. Walker continued her practice via telemedicine.

Her practice is a great example of PPP beneficiaries who don't receive enough attention—the small employers who took out small loans to help with a small number of workers in a very big way. From the truly small businesses to those that have grown their footprint in our State, the PPP has been essential to the survival of these businesses and to the livelihood of their employees.

As I have spoken to small businesses throughout the State, I have repeatedly heard how vital the PPP has been, but that praise has been coupled with requests to make improvements in the

program to ensure that it delivers the most efficient and maximum benefit.

Last week, we took the first step in making some of those changes through the Paycheck Protection Flexibility Act, which was signed into law by the President on Friday. It extends the amount of time businesses can use these funds from 8 weeks to 24 weeks and reduces the portion of the loan that must be used on payroll in order to be forgiven from 75 percent to 60 percent. Many of our restaurants and other businesses that simply closed their doors said there is no way they can spend our PPP loan on payroll when our business isn't even open. This provides flexibility for them and for others. In a nutshell, it gives small business owners the ability to use these loans when and where they are needed.

In the short term, these changes will be critical to protecting jobs and supporting small businesses as they reopen their doors following the coronavirus-induced shutdown. The jobs report we got this last week provides great hope and promise that this recovery will come soon.

In the longer term, we need to ensure that these loans don't end up creating any more burdens for small businesses down the road. Under normal circumstances, businesses can deduct their expenses from their taxable income. Of course, the Paycheck Protection Program covers the cost to many of these expenses, and there is some confusion—particularly, at Treasury—with how businesses should handle their taxes.

I believe the intent of Congress was to allow businesses to continue deducting those expenses. Basically, we were trying to get the money where it was needed most the fastest. By allowing them to continue to deduct those expenses, we do that, but the guidance recently issued by the IRS said the opposite.

While it is fair to say this has led to confusion and frustration among many, Congress needs to take action to eliminate the misunderstanding. Last month, I introduced a bill to make clear that small businesses can still deduct their expenses that were paid for with a forgiven Paycheck Protection loan for their taxes. I know this is an unusual circumstance, but isn't the pandemic the most unusual circumstance we experienced in our lifetime? It calls for extraordinary measures, and I believe, under the circumstances, trying to get money to these small businesses is necessary.

Our goal with this loan program was to help them remain solvent and keep their employees on payroll so they can recover as soon as possible. Without this change, the PPP loan will fail to deliver the maximum on this most basic objective.

The bipartisan Small Business's Expense Protection Act will ensure that small businesses have the cashflow they need to survive today and prosper

in the future. After all, we are not interested in handing out meals now only to slap people on the hands later for taking free food.

The bill has bipartisan support in the Senate. In fact, I introduced it with the chairman and ranking member of the Finance Committee, Senators GRASSLEY and WYDEN, as well as Senator RUBIO, who chairs the Small Business Committee, and Senator CARPER. It has gained the support of organizations that advocate for small businesses, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers of Manufacturers, and the National Federation of Independent Businesses. It also has been endorsed by groups in the financial services industry, including the Texas Society of Certified Public Accountants, the American Institute of CPAs, and the Independent Bankers of Texas. Most importantly, this bill is an answer to the real concerns that businessowners are facing.

As we work to strengthen our coronavirus response and recovery, that should be the guiding principle in the Senate—figure out what is working, what isn't, and act appropriately. This is a big contrast between the approach we are seeing from our House colleagues. A few weeks ago, they passed a bill that was chock-full of ideological policy proposals they know has absolutely no chance of gaining any traction in the Senate, but they didn't seem to care. They did a driveby vote on a Friday and left town and haven't been back since.

Tax breaks for blue State millionaires—they actually want to cut taxes on the richest people in America by reducing or raising the cap on the State and local tax deduction. They want to support marijuana banking, environmental justice grants, soil health studies, changes to election laws.

Forget about solving the problem at hand. Our Democratic colleagues in the House, with this so-called Heroes Act, are attempting to use this pandemic as an opportunity to slip their liberal wish list into must-pass legislation. They are eager to stick taxpayers with another \$3 trillion tab. This isn't going to happen. It has no chance of passing in the Senate, and they actually know it.

These unwanted, unaffordable, and, frankly, laughable proposals are not the types of solutions America needs to recover from this crisis. Indeed, I think it would be wise for a number of folks in the House Democratic leadership to start listening to their constituents for a change rather than try to figure out how do you posture and position yourself favorably for the next election.

I have lost count of the number of video calls I have held—and I know my colleagues have had the same experience—with small business owners, medical professionals, farmers, educators, mayors, and representatives from nearly every corner of my State. I appreciate the countless Texans who have

shared their feedback with me to help me do a better job on their behalf and who will no doubt continue to point out the gaps that need to be filled in the months ahead, particularly when it comes to the next installment of COVID-19 legislation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The Senator from Florida.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST—S. 3837

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I rise to speak today about the growing threat of Communist China.

Xi, the General Secretary of the Chinese Communist Party, is a dictator and human rights violator who is denying basic rights to the people of Hong Kong, cracking down on dissidents, militarizing the South China Sea, and imprisoning more than 1 million Uighurs in internment camps simply because of their religion.

General Secretary Xi is interested in one thing—global domination. It is time we all open our eyes. Communist China despises the freedoms Americans cherish.

The threat we face from Communist China is the new Cold War. This is a Cold War created by General Secretary Xi. It is a Cold War fought with technology, misinformation, and political persuasion. And Communist China's latest weapon of choice is the coronavirus.

Communist China lied about what they knew and spread misinformation around the world, costing hundreds of thousands of lives, millions of jobs, and creating massive economic impact.

All freedom-loving nations around the world need to come together to hold Communist China accountable and financially liable.

One thing we can do today is make sure Communist China can't steal or sabotage American COVID-19 vaccine research. We know Communist China steals U.S. research and intellectual property. We have seen this at our universities; we have seen it at our research institutions and hospitals.

U.S. officials have been warning American firms to safeguard their research against China and others known for stealing U.S. technology. The FBI and the Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency recently warned organizations researching COVID-19 of likely insider threats, targeting, and network compromise by Communist China.

Communist China wants to be first in vaccine development, and unlike the United States and other freedom-loving countries, Communist China will not be quick to share.

Communist China wants to be the dominant world power, and they have made clear they don't care who is harmed in the process. That is why I led my colleagues in introducing the COVID-19 Vaccine Protection Act, which will require a thorough national security evaluation and clearance by the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of State, and the Fed-

eral Bureau of Investigation of all Chinese student visa holders taking part in activities related to COVID-19 vaccine research.

We need to know who in our country is working on vaccine research so that we can make sure American efforts are protected. The United States and all Americans need to get serious about the threat from Communist China.

The COVID-19 Vaccine Protection Act is a great first step, and I look forward to all of my colleagues supporting this effort.

I am also urging everyone to buy American products. It is the single most important thing we can do to send a message to Communist China that their behavior is unacceptable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Judiciary Committee be discharged from further consideration of S. 3837 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER is there objection?

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Ms. DUCKWORTH. Mr. President, none of us in this body is naive enough not to understand the challenges the People's Republic of China represents to our country and to the world. But this bill, which threatens to further incite the tensions already tearing at the fabric of our Nation—this time targeting Asians and Asian Americans—is not the answer.

Yes, we know about how the PRC has targeted our intellectual property and sought to benefit from the research excellence and technological insights developed by our universities and our companies—all for its own scientific and military advancement, all to support an authoritarian system that is dangerous both to living within and outside its borders.

But taking advantage of this moment of fear and division in our country to stoke xenophobia and paint an entire people as guilty by association is not the right way to address this challenge. It is not the American way.

If we have specific counterintelligence threats, let's have our intelligence and law enforcement communities target the threats. I have faith and confidence in their ability to do so if provided the right leadership.

Rather than take that sort of discriminate approach, this bill just discriminates. Even setting aside that blanket moratoriums are the wrong way to deal with the situation at hand, the AAPI community is right to be suspicious that Senate Republicans aren't putting forth any bills today barring visas for nationals from our other adversaries, such as Russia. They are doing it only when it comes to China.

If we need to work more closely with our universities to make sure they un-

derstand who they are engaged with—as students, in accepting donations—then we can do so without attacking an entire group because of their ethnicity or national background but with little other basis or rationale.

We can do better. We as a nation must do better. We cannot and should not go back to the days when there were signs that said “No Irish Need Apply” or when we had quotas for different races and religions at our major universities, let alone the days of the Chinese Exclusion Act. That is not the right direction for America, and it is not the America any of us should be seeking to build.

Unfortunately, there are too many today who would rather see us fractionalized as a nation—who would rather see us divided, not united. In fact, few things would make the PRC happier than to see this sort of legislation go forward because it achieves their end.

So let's take a serious approach to the challenges that we face with the PRC, with safeguarding our universities, our intellectual property, and our scientific research. But let us also take an approach that is consistent with our values as a nation. We can do both. We can and will do better.

I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. SCOTT of Florida. Mr. President, I appreciate my colleague's remarks. Florida and the United States are amazing melting pots, and our States and country have both benefited greatly from the contributions of people from all over the world.

This bill isn't about race. This is a commonsense bill to protect American citizens from the Government of Communist China, which has decided to become our adversary.

This is about protecting Americans from a regime that is actively trying to sabotage our efforts to create a vaccine. We have evidence from our intelligence community that China is trying to do this.

My bill would help identify who in our country is trying to steal or, more importantly, delay, sabotage our success of a vaccine, and that is Communist China's goal.

My colleague has even introduced her own resolution recognizing the importance of vaccinations and immunizations in the United States, and we all agree with her, so blocking my proposal today makes absolutely no sense. Why would my colleague not want to save American lives and make sure we have a vaccine done as quickly as possible? American lives are on the line and depend on this vaccine.

I am clearly disappointed my colleague objected to passing this bill today, but I am completely committed to working with her to get it across the finish line.

As long as our vaccine research remains vulnerable, Communist China will not hesitate to use any tool necessary to obtain this sensitive information.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

H.R. 1957

Mr. KING. Mr. President, someday, 100 years from now, a family will camp on a mesa in Utah or a hillside in North Carolina or a canyon in New Mexico or they will hike the rocky coast of Maine. They will play on a ballfield in Kansas, and it will be because of the work that we are going to do this week in this Congress.

They will not know KING or DAINES or ALEXANDER or PORTMAN or WARNER or MANCHIN or GARDNER or all the others who are going to support our efforts. Our names will be long forgotten, but what we do will be benefiting this country for generations.

There are very few things we can do in our work here that are permanent. Bills can be repealed. Programs can be amended. Times change, and all can change with it.

What we are talking about this week in the Great American Outdoors Act is making a gift to our fellow Americans. Setting aside special places, setting aside opportunities for outdoors and recreation is a sacred trust, and it is one that goes back to the beginning of this country.

As I said, there is very little we can do that is permanent, but this is one of those things. It is the right thing to do, but it also makes sense from the economy's point of view in all of our States.

Acadia National Park in Maine generates more than \$300 million a year in economic activity in the surrounding communities. Our new Katahdin Woods and Waters National Monument is already generating economic activity in the area where it is located. A visit to Maine to see the seacoast and the forest at those two sites would be rewarding for any family.

What we are doing today will enable families to continue to make these kinds of journeys—the next generation and the next and the next. That family will see a sunrise on the coast of Maine, a sunset on a mesa in Arizona. They will not know who it was, but they will know what we did.

In Maine there is a wonderful mountain, Mount Katahdin, the highest point in the State, and it was proposed to be set aside for the people of Maine by the Governor named Percival Baxter in the twenties, one of my predecessors.

The legislature of Maine said: No, we don't have to do that. We shouldn't really do that. Who is going to pay for the roads? We are going to take property out of the tax base. What about the trees?

There were all kinds of reasons for not doing it, so it didn't happen.

It didn't happen while Percival Baxter was Governor, but he dedicated the rest of his life to making it happen. Individually, privately, he purchased full parcels of land to assemble what is now Baxter State Park, one of the gems in this country that contains, at its cen-

ter, Mount Katahdin. He did this as one of the greatest acts of private philanthropy in the history of the United States. It was the legacy of a lifetime.

Few of us will have an opportunity to do what Baxter did, but we have that opportunity now. Where does the money come from? It comes from the people, in the sense of revenues from the use of Federal lands for mineral extraction. This is an idea that was brought forth in 1965 when the Land and Water Conservation Fund was created, and the idea was this: We are using the public's resources and assets, and, therefore, the money that flows from that should go back to the people and should go back into conservation. It is a beautifully symmetrical idea.

The problem is that the fund that was created in 1965 has been systematically looted by the Congresses in successive years. There have been only 2 years since then that it has been fully funded with the funds that are available.

Today, this week, we are going to correct that historic error and make a commitment not only to the people of the United States today but to people we don't even know—the children and grandchildren and great-grandchildren of today's citizens.

The other thing this bill will do is begin to fund the backlog of maintenance at our national parks, bureau of public lands, and other public lands across the country. This sounds pretty boring, pretty mundane, and some of my friends are going to say: Well, you can't do this. We are going to raise a budget point of order.

This is money, again, coming from excess funds in the generation of minerals, oil, and gas. But they are going to say: No, no. You can't do that.

What we are doing here is paying a debt. Deferred maintenance is a debt.

When I was Governor, I used to go to New York to kiss the ring of the rating agencies and hope and beg that they would give us a high bond rating so that our interest costs for our State debt would be low. At one point, I was making a presentation about how prudent Maine was. We didn't have much debt. We paid it off in 10 years, and we really needed this high bond rating.

One of the analysts stopped me, and he said: Governor, don't forget that if you are not maintaining your infrastructure, that is debt just as sure as if you borrow money from the bank, and it is debt that is going to have to be paid, and it is going to have to be paid in the future, which means it is going to cost more.

I had never thought of it that way, but that is what we are doing here. That is why what we are doing here is eminently fiscally responsible because we are paying off a debt, and we are preserving these wonderful, incredible places for people to visit and enjoy.

Believe me, after this spring, people really want to get outdoors. In Maine, for example, Acadia National Park has more than 3½ million visitors a year.

That is a big number. It is a really big number when you realize that more than twice the population of our whole State comes to visit this one small, beautiful, incredible spot on the coast of Maine on Mount Desert Island. So what we are talking about today is paying a debt and making a contribution to the well-being of the American people for generations to come.

When Baxter completed the acquisition of Katahdin and the area that is now Baxter State Park, he had an amazing quote that I think applies to what we are talking about today. He said:

Man is born to die. His works are short-lived. Buildings crumble, monuments decay, and wealth vanishes, but Katahdin in all its glory forever shall remain the mountain of the people of Maine.

Areas across our country in all their glory will forever be part of the legacy for the people of America.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POLICE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, I come to the floor today at a time that you and I have heard the Democrats' latest rallying cry. Astonishingly, the rallying cry is: Defund the police. Defund the police. That is what I am hearing from Democrats all across America. This comes on the heels of a previous battle cry: Abolish ICE. That is what the Democrats are calling for today.

Leading Democrats—radical leftwing lawmakers like ALEXANDRIA OCASIO-CORTEZ—are pushing these very dangerous ideas. Let me say it again. Liberal Democrats all across the country are asking all of us to defund law enforcement in America. If we did that—if we did that—crime would go through the roof, school safety would cease to exist, and the most vulnerable in our society would have no one to turn to or call in case of an emergency. Yet Democratic mayors across the country seem to be on board.

Last week, the Democratic mayor of Los Angeles said that he plans to slash the LA Police Department's budget. New York City Mayor de Blasio has vowed to cut funding for the New York Police Department. The Minneapolis City Council announced Sunday that it would vote to disband—disband—the city's police department and said they had a veto-proof majority.

House Democrats have now just released a new bill that supposedly seeks police reform. This is from a party that just last month pushed a trillion dollar—the total bill was \$3 trillion for the Heroes fund to support the police. Well, now funding for police has purposely been left out of the bill.

As our economy begins to recover—and I will tell you the jobs numbers are very promising—we need to make sure that our communities are safe. This starts at the local level with Governors and mayors in cities like Minneapolis and New York and Los Angeles.

Last week, the Wall Street Journal had an editorial that was titled “Liberal Cities, Radical Mayhem.” Democratic mayors and Governors seem unable to stop the lawlessness. It included a warning. It said:

This isn't merely about damage to property. It's about destroying the order required for city life.

They went on to say:

Non-criminals are afraid to go into these cities in order to make a living.

Now you have seen New York Governor Cuomo blaming Mayor de Blasio, as well as the New York Police Department, for failing to stop the violence in New York City. The Manhattan Institute says that the riots likely caused New York businesses tens of millions of dollars last week alone. This is in damages.

Nationwide, at least 12 people have been killed in the riots last week, including police officers. The rioters have committed many acts of violence against police officers, as well as against innocent bystanders. In New York City alone, 292 officers have been injured last week. One New York police officer was stabbed in the neck, and two others were shot last Wednesday night in Brooklyn. In Los Angeles, 27 officers were injured during just one night of rioting. One officer suffered a fractured skull and another a broken knee.

On Thursday, Attorney General Bill Barr gave a briefing on the administration's efforts to end the violence. The Attorney General also said that President Trump has directed him to spare no effort in seeking justice in the George Floyd case.

The State has filed criminal charges against the four officers, and Federal authorities are investigating civil rights violations. The Attorney General is claiming and now has said that there is clear evidence that extremist groups like antifa were inciting the riots. The lawlessness, he said, must and will stop.

Our free society depends on the rule of law, and the Attorney General has said that the rule of law will prevail. We need to continue to focus on social, economic, educational, and police reforms. Still, no sensible reform involves defunding the police. Police are civil servants. Their job is difficult, and their job is dangerous.

They may need more resources, not fewer, as Democrats across the country are calling for defunding. I am saying they may need more. They may need more training. They may need more resources for body cameras. They may need more resources to help recruit officers who match their communities.

There is much more that needs to be done, and defunding is not part of it.

We can never abandon those who protect us.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CASIDY). The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. RUBIO. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RACISM

Mr. RUBIO. The murder of Mr. Floyd at the hands of law enforcement officers was an outrageous crime that has shocked this Nation, but it would be a mistake to conclude that the unrest of the last 2 weeks are only about his death or are only about relations with the police.

At its core, what this unrest is about is the question of what kind of society we are and what kind of society do we want to be.

A society is a voluntary agreement, by people, to live together. For a society to thrive, those in it must believe that their interests are protected and their voices are heard, but when a substantial number of people in a society come to believe that they are not valued; that they do not matter; or that they are not wanted, then that society will have big problems.

For decades, African Americans have complained that they feel their voices are being ignored, their problems not being addressed, and their lives not valued.

Given our Nation's history with race, this is an uncomfortable grievance—one many would rather avoid. Like a bad debt that must eventually be paid, it is a grievance we can no longer ignore.

Like before, the latest unrest has given rise to voices arguing that the foundations of our Republic are built on systemic racism and must, therefore, be brought down. The only difference is that, this time, claims like these don't just come from the fringes of our politics. Like before, we also have voices that say that, today, race is only a factor in individual cases, distinct from our society at large. Both of these views are wrong.

The foundations of our country are not irredeemably racist. Abolition, women's suffrage, desegregation, the civil rights movement—these were not appeals to overthrow our values; these were demands that we fulfill them.

The Constitution that once considered slaves three-fifths of a human being was ultimately the vehicle that was used to free them and, eventually, to secure their most basic rights.

It is also true that we have made tremendous progress on racial equality over the last 50 years, but there remain shocking racial disparities on health, on education, on housing, on economics, and on criminal justice, and there remains the fundamental truth that any society in which a substantial per-

centage of the people believe that they are treated unjustly is a society that has a problem, a society that can never fulfill its full potential unless those grievances are addressed.

None of this excuses radical, violent extremists setting fires, looting buildings, and hurting innocent people, but it also shouldn't lead us to stupid ideas like defunding the police.

And this is not going to be fixed by endless emails from corporation after corporation trying to prove how woke they are, even as they outsource your job to China.

It is also not going to be fixed by pretending that race is no longer an issue and by accusing everyone who disagrees and says it is of hating America. Yes, there are still vile racists among us, although few of them will ever openly admit it, but in 21st century America, few people consider themselves racist.

The primary reason why race remains relevant today is that the African-American community faces a unique set of challenges that far too few people in positions of power and politics fully understand.

If a child is raised in a stable home, in a safe neighborhood, attends a good school, and they have a private tutor to help them with the SAT, while another child 2 miles away is raised by one parent, or maybe even a grandparent, they live in substandard housing, in a dangerous neighborhood, they attend a school that is failing, or failing them, and they don't have a private tutor for the SAT—on most days they don't have access to Wi-Fi—do these two kids really have an equal opportunity to go to the same college?

If one college student has the connections or the money to do unpaid internships in the summer or to study abroad and another student has to work in the summer just so they can afford to go back to school in the fall, do they really have an equal opportunity to get hired when they graduate?

If one young adult does something stupid and gets arrested, but his parents hire good lawyers, and he is able to avoid having a criminal record, but another young adult who does the exact same thing has to use a public defender, pleads guilty to a lesser charge but now has a criminal record, do they really have an equal opportunity when they apply for the same job?

When policymakers encourage sending manufacturing jobs that once employed African-American men overseas in an effort to benefit those employed in technology and finance, how can we truly expect widespread prosperity for all Americans?

When a disproportionate number of those with these disadvantages comes from one race while a disproportionate number of those with the advantages comes from another, the result is a racial disparity.

Some suggest that these disparities are the result of institutionalized racism or of a deliberate effort designed to harm African Americans.

What I truly believe is that it is the product of something far less sinister but sometimes equally damaging. It is the result of racial indifference, of the fact that many in positions of power and influence are oblivious—are unaware—of the unique challenges that disproportionately face African-American communities across this country.

We must now acknowledge these challenges and address these disparities that they create because, when disparities go unaddressed, they become grievances. When grievances are ignored, it leads to friction and division and, ultimately, unrest.

By no means do these disparities alone fully capture the entirety of the challenge before us. There still remain points of friction, more reminiscent of a different and shameful era in our history.

Here, too, we can also suffer from indifference because the vast majority of Americans simply do not personally know the sting that comes from implicit and sometimes explicit reactions to the color of your skin, which is why true progress requires that we listen to the viewpoints of those who do.

Listen to the young man I know who sees reports of a young man who looks like him—like his uncles, like his grandfather—being murdered by vigilantes in a case of mistaken identity. Who knows, had they had not taken video of themselves doing this, they would have gotten away with it.

Listen, and he will tell you that he feels his life wouldn't matter either if it wasn't because he played professional football.

Listen to the police officer I know who was pulled over while off duty at least seven times by his own department for no reason, and he will tell you of the humiliation of having to explain this to his teenage son.

Listen to what it feels like to see on the news that, when a mother in Miami recently drowned her own autistic son in a terrible tragedy—do you know how she tried to cover it up? By falsely telling the police that he had been abducted by two African-American men demanding drugs.

Listen to what it feels like to read about the indictment of the chief of police of Biscayne Park, FL, who, in an effort to brag about having a perfect crime-solving record, ordered his officers to arrest anybody Black walking through their streets and, if they had any kind of criminal record, pin one of their unsolved crimes on them.

Listen not because it is your fault, not because you are to blame; listen because this is what people who want to live together in harmony must do.

This is the respect we owe one another as colleagues, as coworkers. This is the empathy that is required of us as neighbors, as friends, and as children of the same God.

This may not be your fault, but this is our problem because, until we heal this divide, we will never ever have the kind of society we want, and we will never fulfill the full promise of our Nation.

There is reason for hope, even in a deeply divided country where the political and cultural lines that divide us continue to harden.

A clear consensus has emerged that we can no longer ignore matters of race in America, but it is a fragile consensus, already being tested by loud voices appealing to our most basic fears or those who see the opportunity to advance divisiveness and extreme ideas.

If this is the path we choose, we will all look back at this time with profound regret, and we will be left with a society that is even angrier and more divided than it is now. We will be left with an America that no longer resembles the one we honor when we stand during the National Anthem.

Ironically, we will ultimately be left with an America even further away from the one some kneel to demand.

The only way forward is to treat each other with the empathy and respect required of the people who have decided to share a nation and a future.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

H.R. 1957

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. President, I am here tonight on the floor to talk about a historic opportunity for our country and for our national parks—a true treasure of this country. When Teddy Roosevelt started the national parks, he wanted to preserve some of the most beautiful, pristine lands in America for public use.

It was a good decision. Now we have 84 million acres of parkland all around the country. Some of them are historical parks, battlefields, or Presidents' homes. Some of them are like Yosemite or Yellowstone. The Tetons are known as spectacular, beautiful vistas. Others, like Cuyahoga Valley National Park in Ohio, are really suburban parks. It sits between Cleveland and Akron, OH. It is the 13th most visited park in the United States of America. It is a fantastic park—for fishing, for hiking, for bicycling, for going on a scenic railroad.

People love the parks. There is a good reason for that—because they are spectacular. In fact, visitation at the parks is up. During the 10 years just before the park centennial, which was in 2016, we had about a \$58 million increase in visitors to our national parks.

As the coronavirus begins to fade—thank goodness—more and more people

are wanting to be outside, do things with their family, do something that is not expensive but is fun and healthy. Our national parks are the perfect place. As our parks begin to reopen, we are going to get more and more visitors to those parks.

The problem is, when they go to these parks, they are going to find that there are some issues. These issues are that our national parks over the years have not kept up with their maintenance, with the basics of what you would expect in any organization—the water systems, the roads, the bridges, the bathrooms, the visitor centers, the trails. Many of these are now closed in some of our parks because they haven't had the funding to do the capital improvements, the things you would think about in deferred maintenance at your home. For instance, if your roof starts to leak, you want to fix it because if you don't, then your wall begins to get moldy or your floor begins to couple. That is what is happening in our national parks.

Not only has Congress not provided the money for these more expensive infrastructure changes in our parks, but that has caused additional damage. Every day it is causing more and more damage. It is the biggest challenge we have in the parks.

I was a member of what is called the Centennial Commission for the national parks, which is a private sector group that was formed when I was not in public office a few years ago, and it was working up to the 2016 centennial. The top issue was this deferred maintenance.

I have been on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee and have been passing legislation related to the parks. The Centennial Act we passed in 2016. That was very important because it provided more funding for the parks.

Frankly, we could not come up with enough money through the appropriations process to deal with these long-term problems. Why? Because they are so expensive. In the parks, it is believed there is now a \$12.5 billion shortfall—a \$12.5 billion deferred maintenance project.

We fund the parks every year, but we fund them for the rangers, for the naturalist programs. We fund some of the good work that is being done with schoolchildren and so on, but these big expenditures, like a new road or a new bridge or, in the case of Cuyahoga Valley National Park, a new railway system because the rails themselves need to be improved and replaced—those things are too doggone expensive for annual appropriations.

Several years ago, some of us came up with an idea of providing more public-private partnerships with the parks. The Centennial Act, which I authored, does that. In fact, we have been able to provide a match of greater than 1 to 1 for money that is put into what is called our Centennial Challenge Fund.

The money goes in from the Federal Government, and it has been matched

more than 1 to 1 by private sector money. That is helpful, but it cannot again handle these huge expenditures.

Another idea—Senator MARK WARNER of Virginia actually came to me on this several years ago and said: Why don't we take some of the revenue that is coming from our oil and gas and other energy projects that are on Federal land, both onshore and offshore, and take some of those royalties—the revenue the Federal Government derives from that, which is not going to another purpose—and say that a part of those revenues, not all but a part of it, should be focused on this issue of infrastructure, of this deferred maintenance, that is growing and growing in our parks and getting more expensive every year if we don't fix it.

I love that idea because that is exactly what the oil and gas revenue money ought to be used for—to help in terms of our natural resources. It is not everything. The \$12.5 billion has about \$6 billion of immediate projects that need to be handled right away. These are the priority projects. Those are the ones we focus on. For the next 5 years, in our legislation, we are requiring that enough of those resources from the royalties come in to handle that \$6 billion, assuming that the royalties are there. Right now, the cost of oil is so low that it would be tough to meet that. We think, over time, that will even out, and we will have enough. If there is not, then the money will not be there, but if it is, the money will be there to do exactly what we ought to do, which is, in the end, to save taxpayers' money by fixing some of these problems before they get worse.

Some people say: Well, it is better to do it with an annual appropriations in Congress. I would say to that, in many respects, this funding for our park is a debt unpaid. In other words, it is money that we should have been paying all along to keep up with the roads, the bridges, the buildings, the railway systems, the seawalls—which I will talk about in a minute—but we haven't. We have allowed this to build up.

In a way, this is a debt that is on our books that we have to deal with. Think about it in your family or in your business, if you allow these deferred maintenance problems to continue to grow, you end up having additional costs. We need to take care of it. This is a great way to do it, taking these revenues and applying it to these immediate problems.

By the way, there was a lot of discussion in Congress over the years about shovel-ready projects. When you do infrastructure spending, you want it to be shovel-ready. These are shovel-ready because they have been vetted. We require the Park Service to provide us every year what their infrastructure needs are, what their priority infrastructure needs are and to rank them.

For every single national park property in America, we know what it is. As an example, this is the William

Howard Taft birthplace in my hometown of Cincinnati, Ohio. As you can see, the ceiling is leaking. What happens is, the ceiling leaks. And then, the walls are getting damaged, the floor is getting damaged, and some beautiful furniture from the Taft era is getting damaged. We need to fix it. It is a big expense. It is the entire roof that has to be repaired.

Their annual budget is not nearly enough to do that. They have an annual budget. It takes care of a few park rangers who are naturalists and interpreters. They have a lot of school kids who come through, as an example, and others who want to see the history of William Howard Taft's upbringing, who was a Chief Justice as well as President of the United States. There is no way the annual appropriation from Congress able to do something like that. It needs these additional resources.

Here we are at the Cuyahoga National Valley National Park. This is one of the buildings. As you can see, it is not in great repair. They don't have money to take it down and not enough money to repair these kind of buildings. All they want to do with this building, by the way, is to take it down. It is a hazard. As you can imagine, it is attracting crime and drug use and other issues. They have several buildings like that.

Here is another one. This is the railway I talked about at the Cuyahoga Valley National Park. I am here with the park director. This ranger is a guy who has been all around the country. He told me that in every single one of our parks, he has had to work through this issue. How do you take our budget and make sure you have the rangers, have the naturalist programs, and keep things in order but then don't have enough to pay for these big expenses?

We are right near a bridge here that is also falling down. When the bridge is falling down, the people will not be able to access the trail and the bike trail. It is a big expense. You have to do it.

Here I am at the Perry Monument. This is on Lake Erie. For those of you who have been to Put-in-Bay, you know it is a great place to go. The Perry Monument is awesome. It not only talks about William Perry and his history and legacy but the War of 1812 and all of the veterans of that war and the relationship now between Canada and the United States and the UK, now being our great allies. That was not always so. The War of 1812 was essential for the United States and something as part of a historical park to be remembered.

The seawall that protects that memorial is crumbling. The seawalls don't last forever. This one is not lasting forever, particularly as the Lake Erie water level is increasing. You can see that not only is the seawall crumbling, but there are potholes behind me that cause sinkholes, they call them. People are not allowed to go out on the lakefront here in many places because of

that. That is a huge expense to do a seawall. They have to do it to protect the monument itself. The visitor center there is not ADA compatible, the Americans with Disabilities Act. They need funding to do that, which is a major expense.

These are the kinds of things we are talking about. This is not just my home State of Ohio. This is about \$100 million that needs to come out of this fund just for the State of Ohio.

Again, there are other States that have bigger national parks and more needs and more infrastructure and more roads and bridges that need help, but for us this is really important. We have to be sure that we are protecting this incredible treasure from future generations.

That is what this legislation is about. It is going to be on the floor this week and voted on as part of the Great American Outdoors Act, which includes, also, money for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

I will say, with regard to the national park funding, this funding is directed at stewardship. In other words, not a single penny of the money we are talking about with Restore Our Parks Act that I have been describing can go to expansion of a park—not one penny. All of it has to go toward restoring the parks, toward stewardship of the parks.

I think that is important because whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, I think you should agree that to the extent we have these parks and have this land, we need to take better care of them. It is our responsibility. We are the stewards. Our generation is the steward for future generations. We have not done it. This is an opportunity to right that wrong. We need to get back on track.

My hope is that we will continue to see support for this on both sides of the aisle, both sides of the Capitol. It is really important. We saw on Monday night there was a first trial vote to be able to proceed to the debate on this bill. That vote was overwhelming—80 Senators voted for it out of 100. That is unusual around here. That shows, again, the bipartisan nature of this and the fact that this is carefully thought out. We spent a lot of time on it. We got it out of committee not once but a couple of times. We have done a lot of research on it. We made sure the parks are providing us with good data to know what these projects are, what are their highest priorities.

There is a lot of discussion in this Chamber about putting more money into infrastructure, and maybe that will be done as part of the next legislation. They have been talking about it, in terms of the next stimulus package, to have infrastructure funding. Whether it is rural broadband or whether it is our ports or our roads or our bridges, I think there is an opportunity there. If you put a dollar in, you get more than a dollar back if you do the right kind of smart economic infrastructure.

There are two problems with it. One, often it is not merit-based if Congress

does it. Remember the Bridge to Nowhere years ago where there was a bridge in Alaska that didn't go anywhere, but we were going to pay millions of dollars for it. These are not "bridges to nowhere." These projects have all been vetted. It is a merit-based process.

Second, sometimes they just aren't shovel-ready. In other words, the priority is to fix something, but you don't have the permits; you don't have the approval. These are on national park lands. They have the approval. They are ready to go. They are shovel-ready. They are merit-based.

Discussion around here often about infrastructure is not to pay for it with an offset but rather—because infrastructure spending returns capital, which it does if it is done properly. This would return a lot because this is stuff that is going to involve more visitors, more revenue being raised—through people coming to the parks and attendance at the parks—for the communities, certainly, that the parks are in but even for the parks themselves. We are talking often about not paying for it. Here, we actually do have it paid for. It is not a traditional pay-for—I acknowledge that—but it is funding that comes from the royalties, again, from offshore and onshore oil and gas and other energy projects that goes into fixing our national parks. It is our responsibility as stewards to do that.

My hope is that what we will see tomorrow and the next day and maybe into next week, depending on how long people want to debate this, is that we can continue to have the support we saw on Monday night for our parks. It is one of the true treasures of our country. It is a great asset that if we don't fix it, it will not be there for future generations because these things—once they start to crumble, once the seawall is gone, the monument is gone. When you have a situation where bathrooms are closed or trails are closed, people are going to show up and be, understandably, disappointed that the U.S. Congress did not take advantage of this opportunity if we do not vote for this to be able to fix the parks for future generations.

Finally, I would like to thank not just my colleague Senator WARNER, whom I talked about earlier, who has been a champion on this issue, but also Senator LAMAR ALEXANDER and Senator ANGUS KING. Senator ALEXANDER has been involved in these issues for many years. Back in the Reagan administration, he was on another Commission. I mentioned the Centennial Commission for the parks. He was on another Commission for the great outdoors, which recommended dealing with this issue. Again, it has been the top issue for our national parks.

If we can pass this legislation—\$6.5 billion over the next 5 years for our national parks—this will truly be historic. This is, in a sense, a Teddy Roosevelt moment for us, in this genera-

tion, our generation, to be able to right the wrongs and fix the problems and get our parks back on track so they will be there for future generations.

I also want to thank the President of the United States and his Cabinet because they have been helpful in this—the Secretary of the Interior, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. President Trump himself actually increased the size of this program by saying: Let's not just include our national parks; let's also include our national wildlife; let's include our national forests.

This is even a broader program than just national parks now. This is really important. It was in the President's budget each of the last 3 years, and I appreciate that. That gives us a chance to talk about how to get this not just through the Senate and through the House but actually signed into law because the President is prepared to sign it if we can get our work done here.

I hope my colleagues will do again what they did on Monday night—recognize that this is an important initiative at a time when our country is once again polarized. We have plenty of issues between the coronavirus and what is happening on the streets. Isn't it good to see something that can bring our country, our Senate, our House, and our President together to do something that is important for future generations?

I yield back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

REMEMBERING LARRY WALSH

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, this week, my State of Illinois is saying a fond and final farewell to a deeply loved and respected public servant, Larry Walsh. He devoted 50 years of his life to serving, as he called them, the folks back home. He won his first election to the local school board in 1970 at the age of 21.

He served in local and county government positions and in the Illinois State Senate. For the last 16 years, Larry was county executive for Will County, the fourth largest county in my State of Illinois and one of the fastest growing.

Larry Walsh was as good at retail politics as anybody I have ever seen. He loved politics and he loved people and it showed. People loved him back. Democrats, Republicans, farmers, city folk—they all loved Larry.

He was one of the longest serving county executives in Will County history. When he announced last August that he would not run for a fifth term as executive because the cancer he was battling for 5 years was gaining the upper hand, there was hardly a dry eye in the room. Everyone with whom he had worked was saddened by that announcement.

He said at that press conference: "I've been a very blessed man and a very lucky man."

From where I am sitting, I think the really lucky ones were Larry's folks

back home. Also lucky were those who worked with him and called him a friend. I am honored to count myself among them.

Lawrence Michael Walsh, born on a farm in Elwood, IL, about 10 miles outside of Joliet. He was the second of eight children. His parents were farmers, as were his grandparents and great-grandparents. He carried on that family tradition. Farming was in his blood.

He won his first election to the school board about 3 weeks before his first child was born. Three years later, he was elected to the local board of supervisors. He was elected to the Will County board in 1974 and again in 1992.

From 1997, until the year 2005, Larry served in the Illinois State Senate in Springfield. His Senate district—the 43rd—included most of Will County, parts of Kankakee and Iroquois Counties.

There were cities, suburbs, and farms. In Springfield, he sat in the back row of the chamber. He became good friends of another senator who sat in the seat right next to him.

To some, it was an amazingly odd couple to see the two of them, Larry the farmer and conservative Democrat and his seatmate, a very liberal, left-leaning lawyer from Hyde Park in the city of Chicago.

Both men had an ability that is all too rare in today's brand of politics. They could see beyond labels. They were both passionate about building coalitions and finding common ground, and they both liked a good game of poker. So they became good friends.

In 2004, when his friend decided to run for the U.S. Senate, Larry Walsh was the first Senator to endorse him. Larry took his seatmate to meet the farmers and other folks in small towns in Will and Kankakee Iroquois counties.

Four years later, that seatmate of his was elected President of the United States, and Larry Walsh was right here in Washington to see Barack Obama inaugurated as the leader of our great Nation.

Larry Walsh was a fine and decent man. He was thoughtful and witty, loyal and trustworthy. He seemed to radiate joy, and his joy would fill a room. He was grounded in reality and modest. He had a big booming voice—you couldn't miss it—and you sure as heck could not miss his laugh, and there were plenty of them.

His friends included a President, Cabinet members and Governors and men and women who swept the floors in his offices.

In 2007, Will County Democrats created a new award to honor those working to promote progress and the common good. They named the award after the man who exemplified those qualities—the Larry Walsh Lifetime Achievement Award.

Well, fittingly, the first recipient of the Larry Walsh Lifetime Achievement Award was Larry Walsh. I laughed

about that so many times and never let him forget it. Every time he visited my office, I would remind him that he was the first recipient of the Larry Walsh Award.

Larry's admirers transcended party labels. George Pearson, chairman of the Will County Republican Party, told a reporter that Larry "greeted me each time we met with a handshake, a smile and a pat on the shoulder. You would never have known we were on opposite sides of the political aisle, and that is what made Larry popular with Will County residents."

The other thing that made Larry Walsh so popular with the people of his county was that he was just incredibly good at his job.

As county executive, Larry worked hard to professionalize and modernize county government and make it more responsive. He built a strong financial foundation for this great county, which improved its bond rating and enabled him to lead the largest capital improvement program in the history of the county. The county built new roads and bridges, a new public safety complex, new county health facilities, and a new courthouse scheduled to open in October.

In the Illinois State Senate, he was instrumental in, among others things, developing the Abraham Lincoln National Cemetery in Elwood; the redevelopment of the Joliet Arsenal into a modern intermodal freight terminal, the CenterPoint Intermodal Center; and the designation of the Midewin National Tallgrass Prairie—the first national tallgrass prairie in the United States.

There was a time when we thought it was the end of the world for Will County when Joliet Arsenal was given up by the Federal Government, but thanks to Larry Walsh and his buddy George Sangmeister and many others, it became a showpiece for the rest of the United States to see how this piece of Federal real estate had a bright, bright future.

Larry was most proud of his family. My wife Loretta and I offer our deepest condolences to Irene, Larry's wife of 50 years, and the love of his life. I called her on the phone just the other day when Larry passed, and we talked about the rough period toward the end of his life, but we knew it was coming. Today, we look back on it as a moment of trial that he endured until that moment when he left and left behind not only that love of his life Irene but their daughter Sarah, their five sons, Larry Jr. and Shawn—both of whom followed dad into public service—Frank, Matthew, and Brian and 20 grandkids. He was so proud of every single one of them.

Because of the pandemic, the sendoff for Larry is going to be much smaller than it would have been in Will County. There will be visitation from 2 to 8 on Thursday, followed by a private funeral mass on Friday, and local folks are expected to line the route from the church to the cemetery.

A couple of final thoughts about my friend Larry: He was a bridge builder. He had inexhaustible patience when it came to searching for common ground in order to make government work and solve big problems. Don't we need more leaders like him today?

Larry loved life. Every Christmas season, for years, the local theater company in Joliet put on a stage production of that classic movie "It's a Wonderful Life." The show was always broadcast on a local radio station, and for many years, right up to this last Christmas, Larry Walsh played the part of Clarence. You will remember Clarence at the end of the movie. He was the guardian angel. Clarence was always hoping to earn his wings. Clarence was assigned to watch over George Bailey, who is so despondent one Christmas Eve he is thinking about jumping off a bridge. Clarence the guardian angel's assignment was to get George to change his mind.

Clarence did that by showing George how much the people in his hometown would have missed had George not been part of their lives. Clarence tells George:

Strange, isn't it? Each man's life touches so many other lives. When he isn't around, he leaves an awful hole, doesn't he?

Many of us are feeling an awful hole today with the passing of Larry Walsh—this good man and devoted public servant.

Even though we can't schedule the kind of Irish wake that Larry so richly deserved, there is something we can do.

Besides his family, his faith, his community and public service, there was something that Larry was also fond of. After a hard day of work, Larry was known to enjoy a Pabst Blue Ribbon beer. In his honor, if you are so inclined, may we raise a PBR to Larry and a life well lived, and may we resolve to fill the hole he has left by following his uncommon example.

CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

Mr. President, this past weekend, I went back to Illinois and visited with two different groups—one on Friday, another on Saturday. They were young African Americans on the South Side of Chicago and in my hometown of Springfield.

I wanted to sit down with these young people, some just barely high school students, who had been engaged in protests and demonstrations in their hometowns and ask them what it was about, what it meant to them. I wanted to hear it firsthand.

They talked about the killing of George Floyd in Minneapolis and how it changed the conversation about justice in America, and it moved them to stand up and speak up.

I am proud to say that those I met with have engaged in peaceful demonstrations consistent with American values and our Constitution.

I am proud of them because there were no distractions. They were focused on Black Lives Matter and true justice in America.

When we met, I asked questions of some of them. I wanted to know a little bit more about them and their lives and what brought them to this moment.

I asked each of them about the conversation—you know, that conversation when young people are called in by their parents and warned about the perils and challenges of being Black in America.

One young woman remembered her mother cautioning her to always ask for a receipt with every purchase to prove, if ever challenged, that the item had not been shoplifted. Many talked about hairstyles and clothing that they learned to be dangerous in the eyes of some White Americans.

They were even warned about the danger of any contact with the police and how their tone of voice and every move had to be carefully considered—every one of them.

Every one of them remembered the first time they were called the "N" word.

That graphic video of the last moments of George Floyd's life, when he was pleading "I can't breathe" and the cold stare of the policeman, with his knee on George Floyd's neck, ignoring the pleas for mercy—those images touched the conscience of America and the world, and these young people were touched by it.

They know and we all know, sadly, that what happened to George Floyd was not an exception.

Since 2015, the Washington Post has been following the number of people shot and killed by police. Through 2019, the total number has hovered near 1,000 annually. Ninety-four percent of the victims were armed.

The Post reports:

The number of black and unarmed people fatally shot by police has declined since 2015, but whether armed or not, black people are shot and killed at a disproportionately higher rate than white people.

They note in their newspaper this morning the death rate by race in unarmed shootings was 7.3 percent for Whites, 10.7 percent for Hispanics, and 30.3 percent for Blacks.

The anger and pain that we have seen on the streets in recent days is a reflection of generations of trauma. People are fed up with racism that has led to this injustice, and many of these young people leading this protest are determined not to live in its shadow any longer.

There are hundreds of thousands of police officers in our Nation. Most will never use their firearms. Many who do must make split-second, life-or-death decisions. I know many of them personally. I believe the ones I know are professional and humane.

If we are honest, we know that within their ranks are police officers who do not have the training or temperament to be entrusted with the authority and power they have been given. We need an honest conversation with police chiefs and law enforcement leaders

on inherent bias, use of force, training and accountability for unjust actions.

Prosecutors and judges need to join us in the pursuit of real justice, and legislators like myself need to undo the damage of a criminal justice system fraught with racial disparity.

The Obama Task Force on 21st Century Policing released a report in 2015 to strengthen community policing and restore trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve. The Trump administration shelved this effort in 2017. It is time to take it off the shelf.

This week, I join Senators BOOKER and HARRIS in cosponsoring the Justice in Policing Act of 2020—a comprehensive approach to bring accountability to policing, change methods and practices, and build trust. It draws the line on odious police practices and sets goals and standards for recruitment, training, and retraining.

Even that is not enough. Justice in America requires more than improving law enforcement. We cannot put racism behind us until we invest in opportunities for quality education, medical care that meets the highest standards, jobs with livable wages, opportunities, and safe affordable housing.

The young people I met with want an America that is more just. Let them lead us into a future where we can all breathe more easily.

I held hearings on race in America when I was chairman of the Subcommittee on the Constitution and Civil Rights—one in December of 2014. The hearing was held just a month after the death of Tamir Rice, a 12-year-old boy shot and killed by a police officer in Cleveland while he played with a toy gun.

I said then, and, sadly, I must repeat today, when unarmed African-American men and boys are killed in our streets, there is much work to be done to find justice in America.

This followed a hearing I had held the previous year where we heard heartbreaking testimony from Sybrina Fulton, the mother of Trayvon Martin, and LUCY MCBATH, the mother of Jordan Davis. LUCY has been elected to the U.S. House of Representatives from Georgia since.

Both of these innocent young Black men were gunned down by violent White vigilantes.

Now we again grieve the lives of two Black men and a Black woman—lives cut far too short in incidents of inexplicable and inexcusable violence—Ahmaud Arbery out for a jog; Breonna Taylor at home in her bedroom; and George Floyd on a curbside in Minneapolis.

Once again, those gut-wrenching words “I can’t breathe” bring tears to our eyes. How many more names of Black men, women, and children will we cry out in protest before things change? We need to have an honest American conversation with law enforcement officers about training, inherent bias, use of force, and con-

sequences for wrongdoing. We need to prohibit police misconduct that is discriminatory and deadly. We must recruit and train the next generation of law enforcement to protect and serve everyone in America. We need to invest in social services instead of expecting law enforcement to intervene in crisis situations that they are not equipped to deal with.

This will require us—Senators, other legislators—to continue to undo the damage of a criminal justice system that is unfair, in many respects—most importantly, require those of us with privilege and power to step back and listen to African Americans affected by pervasive, systemic racism.

What can we do? A good place to start is President Obama’s task force. As I mentioned earlier, it was that administration’s response to deal with community policing and trust in the community. It was shelved by the Trump administration, and I think it would be a good start—a bipartisan start—for the Trump administration to bring it down from the shelf and start a conversation.

We have an important role to play right here in Congress. Unfortunately, since Republicans took the Senate majority in January 2015, the Senate Judiciary Committee has rarely addressed issues of racism in our Nation.

The last hearing on policing in the Judiciary Committee was actually 5 years ago—November 2015—chaired by the junior Senator from Texas. It was entitled “The War on Police: How the Federal Government Undermines State and Local Law Enforcement.” It was a thinly veiled attack on the efforts of the Obama administration’s Civil Rights Division.

The Senate Judiciary Committee chairman, LINDSEY GRAHAM, has announced the Senate will hold a hearing on police misconduct next week. I was glad to hear it. I hope it is not just one and done. We need multiple hearings—long overdue.

It is critical that we also hear from Attorney General William Barr. We need to know whether the Justice Department will revive the efforts of the Obama administration to address police misconduct, and we need answers about what happened at Lafayette Square last week—right outside the White House, when the Attorney General reportedly ordered Federal law enforcement to clear peaceful demonstrators. They used rubber bullets and some form of gas. The Attorney General insists it wasn’t tear gas, but I have seen it, and it looks like some sort of a gas spray designed to push the demonstrators away.

Hearings aren’t enough. We need to do something the Senate rarely does anymore—pass a law. How about that? We need legislation on this subject, not lamentation.

I am proud to join Senators CORY BOOKER and KAMALA HARRIS in introducing this Justice in Policing Act. Our bill includes the End Racial

Profiling Act—legislation I have cosponsored for many years, finally prohibiting the scourge of racial profiling.

In 2012, I held a hearing on this bill to end racial profiling. This was the only hearing that the Senate has held on racial profiling in 20 years.

Our bill would ban choke holds—like the one that killed George Floyd. It will ban no-knock warrants—like the one that led to the death of Breonna Taylor.

In 2014, many Americans were shocked to see tanks rolling through the streets of Ferguson, MO. Shortly afterward, I held a hearing in the same subcommittee where we heard compelling testimony about the shocking reality that local police departments all over the country are armed to the teeth with billions of dollars of military surplus equipment.

Our bill will limit the transfer of military-grade equipment to State and local police so the weapons of war do not become commonplace in the streets of America.

The Justice in Policing Act also requires the use of dashboard cameras and body cameras for Federal officers, State, and local law enforcement.

Our bill establishes a National Police Misconduct Registry to prevent officers who have engaged in misconduct from simply moving to another department without accountability. It will ensure that individuals whose constitutional rights are violated by police officers can recover in court.

After the Civil War, the Congress passed the Civil Rights Act of 1871 to ensure that any person acting in official capacity who deprives another of a constitutional or legal right can be held liable in court. However, judges have strictly limited the use of this statute to recover damages for police misconduct by creating what is known as qualified immunity for police officers.

The Justice in Policing Act will end this. This is a doctrine created by judges and never approved by Congress.

I call on Senator MCCONNELL to do more than just join in speeches about George Floyd. I call on him to bring the Justice in Policing Act to the floor of the Senate as soon as possible.

Wouldn’t it be amazing, with all the protestations and all of the statements made by all of the people in the streets, by representatives in this administration from the Department of Justice who came before our committee today, and each and every one standing up and saying they are concerned about George Floyd, if we in the U.S. Senate actually considered a bill on the subject—actually considered passing a law on this matter?

We owe it not just to the Senate, we owe it to George Floyd, Breonna Taylor, to Ahmaud Arbery, and all of the Black and Brown lives we have lost in these brutal acts of racial injustice.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. MCSALLY). The Senator from Alaska.

H.R. 1957

Ms. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, last night, I had the opportunity to join probably more than 80 of my colleagues in voting for a motion to proceed to S. 3422, the Great American Outdoors Act.

This bill is sponsored by a strong group of Senators here—Senator GARDNER of Colorado, Senator DAINES of Montana, and Senator MANCHIN have been working very hard on the LWCF piece.

Senator ALEXANDER, Senator PORTMAN, and Senator WARNER are working on the parks' deferred maintenance aspect of this measure. There has been lot of work from a lot of Members and a lot of good thought that has gone into it and some good policy behind it, but I would like to share with colleagues some of the reservations I have, albeit this is good policy, solid policy in so many areas.

As with much of everything that we can do on the Senate floor, we can always seek to improve. With some of my colleagues, I think we have some ideas in areas where we can improve our Great American Outdoors Act.

I come from a State where we know a little bit about our great outdoors. I know we all like to advertise our scenery, the wildlife that we have, but back in Alaska we have some pretty unrivaled scenery. We have the mountains. We have got the glaciers. We have some of our State's most important natural features that have been conserved in some world-famous national parks, from Katmai and Denali to the Kenai Fjords, Wrangell-St. Elias, Glacier Bay—names that so many Americans know and have visited or hope to one day visit before they die.

We actually had an advertising campaign: See these majestic landscapes before you die.

Americans recognize the importance of preserving our very best lands and making the most of our ability to experience their natural splendor. We are not welcoming visitors this year in a very different time, as we are dealing with COVID, but we have no doubt that the tourism industry will be back. It will be back better than ever before. In fact, in yet another advertising campaign, we remind people that Alaska waits for you, and we would welcome you at any time.

We have more than 223 million acres of Federal lands in total. Included within that are more than 76 million acres that are managed by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, more than 71 million acres managed by the Bureau of Land Management, more than 52 million acres managed by the National Park Service, and more than 22 million acres managed by the Forest Service.

So we have a lot. We have a lot of Federal land, and that means that the Federal Government has a major responsibility to help us maintain it and preserve it, just like in every State.

So I would like to take a few minutes to discuss how the policy that we will be considering can help us do just that.

The Great American Outdoors Act combines two bills, again, that we reported from the Energy and Natural Resources Committee last year. The first one is S. 500, the Restore Our Parks Act, as I mentioned, led by Senators PORTMAN, ALEXANDER, WARNER, and KING, which aims to tackle the Park Service's \$12 billion deferred maintenance backlog.

The second one is S. 1081, from Senators MANCHIN, GARDNER, and DAINES, to provide full and mandatory funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

To tackle deferred maintenance needs, the Great American Outdoors Act establishes a new National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund. That fund will provide up to \$1.9 billion per year for 5 years to relevant Federal land management agencies.

The Great American Outdoors Act also expands the list of agencies that can receive funding beyond the Park Service to include the Forest Service, Fish and Wildlife Service, BLM, and the Bureau of Indian Education, which also has significant maintenance needs. This was something we recognized within the Energy Committee as we were looking at the status and situation on the maintenance of national parks. It begs the question, What about our other public lands?

In Alaska, our forest lands are great sources of recreation and opportunity, but they, too, have seen a maintenance backlog just continue to accumulate. When you visit Denali, the Grand Canyon, or Yosemite, you may not necessarily notice immediately the deferred maintenance issues. Likewise, as you drive into Washington, DC, you might not even realize that the George Washington Parkway is part of our National Park System, let alone a major contributor to the agency's maintenance backlog. The reality is that the Park Service, in particular, has carried substantial backlogs for a long time.

As chairman of the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee, this is something we have been working to try to get on top of, but it is like getting on top of this wave. If you can't get on top of it, it is just going to bury you. That is what has happened when you think about the \$12 billion backlog. These deferred maintenance needs just aren't possible to resolve through the annual appropriations process despite the considerable best efforts we have made. The longer they last, the more they jeopardize the visitors' ability to safely enjoy our national treasures.

In Alaska, the National Park Service has \$106 million in deferred maintenance. When you think about what I just outlined to you in terms of the number of acres we have in Federal land and parks and BLM refuge, \$106 million out of \$12 billion doesn't seem like that much. It is a lot to us back home, and \$33 million of that is considered critical.

Within Denali National Park we have a pretty significant visitor center, the Eielson Visitor Center, and the roof and the furnaces in various buildings need to be replaced there. We have a water treatment center at the Wrangell-St. Elias headquarters that need to be replaced. I think it is important for people to realize because those are not things you are going to notice. You are not going to notice that the road is in disrepair or you don't have restroom facilities, but when you are going into the park toward the end of the summer—in early September—and there is no heat in the visitor center, you are probably going to notice that.

I think it is important to recognize that the current list of deferred maintenance does not account for some of the very major challenges we are facing in Alaska, such as the situation with the Denali route. It is the only route in and out of the park. It needs substantial improvements due to ongoing subsidence. The estimates are all over the map, but, in fairness, we are talking tens of millions, perhaps in excess of \$100 million, to help repair or to perhaps even reroute that access.

When thinking about deferred maintenance in Alaska in the parks, we can account for only a fraction of that system. Recreation is the biggest user of our national forest system lands, but our forestlands, trails, and campgrounds need about \$5 billion in repairs. In Alaska, we have about \$105 million in backlog up there.

BLM manages nearly 50,000 buildings and structures—bridges, trails, and roads mostly in Western States, but they also have a growing backlog. In total in the Department of the Interior, we have about \$17.3 billion in deferred maintenance in fiscal year 2019. When combining that with the Forest Service, their maintenance backlog is \$22.5 billion in our Federal land management agencies.

The Great American Outdoors Act is attempting to remedy the issue by providing a downpayment to upgrade and to improve the aging infrastructure on our public lands. I kind of outlined the need for why we are here today. I indicated that I support funding to address the maintenance backlogs, making sure visitors are able to enjoy our landscapes and have the safest, most enjoyable experience as they see America's beauty. That is important. I think it is also important that we are cognizant about how we pay for this maintenance, how we address that.

As I mentioned, I am on the Appropriations Committee. We are trying to get ahead of this by making sure we are not seeking to add more to the account without making sure we are caring for the lands already under our jurisdiction.

The second part of the Great American Outdoors Act focuses on the Land and Water Conservation Fund. LWCF provides for both Federal and land acquisition and financial assistance for States' recreation development. You

will hear me talk a lot about LWCF stateside programs because I think it recognizes the role that States play in facilitating recreational access and leverages funds to build out those opportunities.

We have certainly seen the benefits in Alaska. Providing a few local examples, the State of Alaska has used LWCF matching funds to build ballfields in Utqiagvik, an accessible urban playground in Anchorage, and a ski area in Cordova.

I do think it is important for us to remember how LWCF was established, the core purpose of why it came about in the first place. Congress established this program in 1965 to build a national recreation system primarily in the East. To accomplish that, the Federal Government determined that it needed the ability to acquire this private land. So our predecessors provided LWCF with the authority and financial means to do so through revenues from offshore oil and gas.

We had a lot of discussion in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee about the Land and Water Conservation Fund. I was a proud sponsor of last year's lands package, which made permanent the collection and deposit provisions in the LWCF and put an end to years of uncertainty and lapses in those deposits. I was pleased to be able to help offer a series of commonsense reforms, which included a requirement that at least 40 percent of the funding go to stateside programs every year.

I also believe that LWCF's ability to acquire new Federal lands should be focused on the eastern States where the proportion is dramatically lowered. I also believe that it is better—much better—to decide LWCF's funding in the appropriations process each year in the context of the rest of our Nation's conservation and budgetary priorities, as opposed to mandatory funding.

I have stated that we should have an opportunity to discuss these priorities related to our obligations to our parks and to our conservation efforts. Again, I believe it is only fair and honest, as we debate this subject, that we recognize there are areas where we can improve this bill.

I come to this debate from a very constructive place. I think I have some very commonsense ideas to expand the bill to include conservation-related priorities that make sense for Alaska and our States across the country, priorities such as offshore revenue, which I am going to be speaking to in just a moment. There are some pretty simple, commonsense things; for example, if we are going to allow for deferred maintenance to be addressed within the LWCF account, why would we not want to make sure that our States have a similar flexibility?

In States like Alaska, where we have significant Federal lands already, it is not that we need to be buying up additional lands into the Federal account in Alaska, but what we do need is to help preserve those lands we have now

but that are subject to aggressive erosion. To be able to use funds from the LWCF account to deal with a coastal resilience initiative is something my colleague from Louisiana and my colleague from Rhode Island—we have been talking about how we can help improve that.

I think these discussions are not only timely but smart policy. I think it would be unfortunate if the Senate chooses not to allow good ideas to be incorporated.

We have a measure in front of us that has strong bipartisan support. We recognize that, and that is good at a time when we are trying to come together as a Congress and as a nation. I take great pride in the fact that, once again, leadership turns to the Energy and Natural Resources Committee for good ideas that have come out of our committee. The opportunity to include strong measures that will enhance this bill is something I think we need to be focusing on.

I would like to address the amendment that my colleague from Louisiana, Senator CASSIDY, has filed and that I am cosponsoring. This is an initiative that he has worked on, and he has explained that it is a matter of equity. It is a matter of equity and fairness as to how revenues are shared with the coastal States that enable offshore energy development.

Adding key portions of the COASTAL Act, S. 2418—which I am proud to cosponsor and was reported out of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee—to the measure we have in front of us, I think, makes sense. Senator CASSIDY has spoken to how this would expand offshore revenue sharing for States along the Gulf of Mexico, which post and support some of the most impressive and expensive coastal facilities anywhere in the world. If any of our colleagues have not had the opportunity to view what happens in the offshore areas of Louisiana, it is a trip that should be a priority.

Senator CASSIDY has spoken to the Gulf of Mexico piece of it. I want to speak to what the amendment would do for Alaska because it includes provisions that have been written by myself and by Senator SULLIVAN to establish a revenue-sharing program specific to our State, which has prolific offshore resources that we hope, one day, to be able to safely produce for the good of the Nation. But we are in a very, very different position than they are in the Gulf. We need investment to improve our coastal infrastructure, particularly in the Arctic. We have some different conservation priorities from some non-coastal States, which are enshrined in the purposes of the language in the amendment.

These principles of equity and fairness that we talk about as they relate to the Gulf of Mexico are the same principles here.

Just like from onshore Federal development, local governments and communities need to share in the revenues

from offshore development. We are the ones that host it, we bear the impacts, and the benefits the entire country derives from it simply wouldn't be possible were it not for these host States.

I think that this bill, this Great American Outdoors Act, is the right place to address offshore revenue sharing because everything within it relies on oil and gas revenues and LWCF, the fund that will help with our deferred maintenance. Everything relies on oil and gas revenues.

So, for as much vitriol as there may be out there, and criticism, as the industry takes, I think this might be a good time to recognize that oil and gas production generates Federal revenues, and it is these Federal revenues that fund these conservation priorities for dozens and dozens of Members on this floor and for hundreds of stakeholder groups.

Again, that is what has been happening within the LWCF, and it is about to be true for the deferred maintenance backlog, that where you are getting this funding source is from the oil and gas revenues. Those funds wouldn't come were it not for places like Louisiana, the Gulf Coast States, and again, hopefully, one day, Alaska.

When it comes to offshore revenue sharing, Alaska faces a disparity not only with onshore rates but with other coastal producers. So you have got the four Gulf States—Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas—that currently have a limited revenue sharing program established by the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006. Alaska, however, receives no revenue sharing, zero revenue sharing beyond the near-shore areas that all coastal States receive under section 8(g) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act.

If Alaska is granted offshore revenue sharing, know that we will put it to productive use for conservation and environmental purposes. I think it is instructive because I think there is so much rhetoric and concern that we can't be doing further development in Alaska. It just shouldn't happen. Well, let me share with you, again, we are seeing coastal impact. We are seeing levels of erosion. We would like to be able to address the expenses that are associated with it.

So within the amendment that Senator CASSIDY has filed, in the Alaska provision, we looked specifically to authorize purposes—coastal protection, conservation, restoration, and assistance, including relocation for communities that are directly affected by coastal erosion, melting permafrost, and climate change related lawsuits.

Another authorized use is mitigation of damage to fish, wildlife, and natural resources. Adaptation planning, vulnerability assessments, emergency preparedness to build healthy and resilient communities, and the installation and operation of energy systems to reduce energy costs and greenhouse emissions, and then programs at institutions of higher education, these are the

primary prescriptions that Alaska would use its shared revenues for.

If you support the Great American Outdoors Act, you will be able to support offshore revenue sharing and the significant environmental benefits that it would provide to the Gulf of Mexico and to the State of Alaska, but we can only get there if we have an opportunity for the good ideas—substantive ideas—that Senator CASSIDY is leading with his COASTAL Act that I have introduced with regards to concerns that I briefly outlined and that I know that other Members have raised and shared as well.

I appreciate the support that we have received for offshore revenue sharing within the committee process itself. We are now asking for the full Senate to support the coastal States in equitable sharing of revenues. I think this is a key step, and I would urge that we have an opportunity to adopt that as we move forward.

With that, I yield to my friend, the Senator from Louisiana. I thank him for his leadership on this initiative. I have been so impressed not only by his advocacy when it comes to addressing the fairness and the equity issues that are associated with revenue sharing and what we need to do to lift the cap, but also to his commitment to ensure that his State and other coastal States that are seeing impact from climate change and seeing impact from erosion, that the conservation purposes that we have spoken to will have an opportunity to be addressed. I am thankful to be able to work with him and to follow his lead on this.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, first, I thank the Energy Committee chair for her kind words and for her advocacy. I may be speaking for a bit, and then when the majority leader comes, I will interrupt and allow him to close, and then I ask unanimous consent to finish my speaking, if that is OK.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CASSIDY. Madam President, I am on the Senate floor today to talk about the protection and restoration of the Gulf Coast, an issue extremely important to those I serve in Louisiana in the Gulf Coast, but important to the rest of the Nation, whether the rest of the Nation knows it or not. I will explain why that is.

In the coming days, the Senate will vote on whether or not to pass the Great American Outdoors Act. This bill dedicates funding over 5 years towards deferred maintenance. We have spoken about it at length. It adds an additional \$900 million to the Land and Water Conservation Fund, an amount which is already authorized but never funded. This would make it mandatory that it is funded.

Many will say that this is a good thing or even a great thing. I will tell

you, for Louisiana, for the Gulf Coast, and for a lot of other States, this is not a great thing in its current form. In fact, I will show how this bill currently benefits only certain States at the expense of others.

First, it is almost entirely funded with money from the Gulf of Mexico oil and gas production. So 50 to 60 percent of the dollars go to five States. So we are going to put up about \$9.5 billion, and 50 to 60 percent of it goes to five States. Needless to say, that lacks equity. I would argue that we can make this bill better in terms of benefiting many more Americans than it currently does.

First, let's speak about where the revenue comes from. Again, about \$1.9 billion a year comes from energy production, redistributing that across the country, as we mentioned, to deferred maintenance programs. About 90 percent of that revenue from which this money will be extracted comes from oil and gas production in the Gulf of Mexico. This will be about \$4.3 billion coming from the Gulf of Mexico. Now, this makes the Gulf of Mexico the primary revenue source for this whole project. It adds \$900 million to what is already designated the Land and Water Conservation Fund. There is \$1.9 billion a year for 5 years to go for deferred maintenance, and this is in addition to \$125 million a year, which is currently being spent on the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Now, some of the advocates, by the way, just for a point of clarity, will say or imply that these dollars are not otherwise allocated. Let's just be clear. The dollars are allocated. Right now, the dollars that will be used for this fund come to the U.S. Treasury and are used for the priorities of the American people, and they are allocated for, you name it, higher education, debt service, paying troops, defense, et cetera. This would make it mandatory that a certain amount of this money would go towards both deferred maintenance and the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Now, the Land and Water Conservation Fund is supposed to be a fund that functions to benefit, kind of, all Americans, but I would argue that it really benefits select regions of America. If you look at this map, where the dollars are spent are not where the people live. These are the coastal States, and here are the inland States. As it turns out, the areas that are most benefited by this funding are not on the coast. And, yet, as you will see in a second, that is where the people live.

If you live in a coastal State, on a per capita basis, your State receives about \$7.53 per person. If you live in one of these inland States, from the Land and Water Conservation Fund, you get \$17.66, more than two times plus. In fact, from about 2011 to 2015, if you are in one of these inland States, you got a ratio of almost 8-to-1 in terms of the dollars spent in the coastal States. If you take out Washington,

DC, and Virginia and maybe New York, then this \$7.53 is going to go far lower. If you are not one of those three States and you are on the coast, you are not doing very well on a per capita basis.

To make that point, in 2015, about 40 percent of the Nation's population lived in a county or parish that was directly on a coastline, and 82 percent of people live in a State which has a coastline. So 82 percent of the people live in one of these yellow States, and yet, on a per capita basis, two plus times is spent on those living in States which are inland.

Now, my point is that the dollars are not spent relative to where people live. This disparity disproportionately impacts States such as South Carolina, Georgia, North Carolina, Maine, and other coastal States. Now, I am a person who would rather have a solution, and the solution I am going to propose does not take money away from the Great American Outdoors Act. They will still continue to receive, in relatively sparsely populated States, a significant sum of the money.

I worked with Senator WHITEHOUSE on a bipartisan solution that would at least add some equity for those States which are coastline, as opposed to being inland. Now, that said, we acknowledge national parks have deferred maintenance. At the end of fiscal year 2018, this was estimated at roughly \$12 billion, but those parks are not uniformly distributed.

I mentioned earlier how a disproportionate amount of the money is going to go to five different States. According to the Park Service data, if you just looked at deferred maintenance, which will presumably guide where this money is spent, California; Washington, DC; Virginia; New York; North Carolina; Wyoming; Arizona; and the State of Washington make up nearly 60 percent of the deferred maintenance needs at national parks. If you live in one of those States, you are doing well, but if you are living in a State other than those, not so well.

Now, some will say that even though almost 60 percent of the money is going to seven States, everyone in the country benefits because you might visit the park, or we are all in it together, so why shouldn't I support a national park in a State which is far away from my hometown?

I suppose there is something to be said to that. On the other hand, if the person saying that lived in one of the States, which is getting just a tiny fraction of the total sum of dollars, and, yes, the people in their State will leave their State and go spend their money in Montana, for example, that will be great. People in Montana, on a per capita basis, get far more than anybody else.

We are in it together, I suppose, but you probably wouldn't reverse it. You probably wouldn't say: Wait a second, we think it is unfair that seven States get almost 60 percent of the dollars. We actually think it is better to be more

equitably spread, or maybe you would. I hope that you would.

States like Kansas, Iowa, and Nebraska see almost no benefit. Collectively, the deferred maintenance in these three States—Kansas, Iowa, and Nebraska—is .2 percent of total deferred maintenance backlog. It is the same for Connecticut, Delaware, Minnesota, and New Hampshire. Again, while there is deferred maintenance in Gulf Coast States, the real benefit to our States is investing in the coastline, which has a direct impact on sustainability.

To be fair, by the way, the Gulf of Mexico States do currently benefit. The Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act shares revenue with the four Gulf Coast States. We use this revenue, by State constitution, for coastal restoration. There is a little bit of irony, as the Senator from Alaska pointed out, that those who strongly support this bill oftentimes strongly disapprove of drilling for oil and gas, particularly in coastal areas, but they are now reliant upon that drilling in order to fund the Great American Outdoors Act.

I do believe that we can address this inequity, which has been highlighted. I put together a bill, as I mentioned earlier, with SHELDON WHITEHOUSE, called the COASTAL Act. We are working with other colleagues. We passed it out of the Energy Committee.

Actually, by that, Senator WHITEHOUSE was not on that bill, but we passed the COASTAL Act out of the Energy Committee with a bipartisan vote. The junior Senator from Alabama is my cosponsor. He should cosponsor, and he did. Alabama benefits exponentially more from the GOMESA Act than anything that the Great American Outdoors Act has to offer.

So all of this is to say that the Gulf Coast just wants equity. We want a more general benefit, not almost 60 percent of the benefit, going to seven States, and we also want the money to be distributed nationwide where people live, as opposed to where they might go on a 1-week vacation every 5 years.

I will speak just very briefly about the COASTAL Act. It is a bipartisan bill, again, passed by the Senate Energy Committee, committing more dollars towards environmental protection, reducing flood risks to businesses and industries along the Gulf Coast, protecting regions of the Gulf Coast for public recreation—we talked about recreation elsewhere. But committing dollars for all coastal States for environmental protection, once more, does not take money away from the Great American Outdoors Act.

Colleagues have heard me talk about the importance of revenue sharing for environmental protection. Again, the COASTAL Act passed out with bipartisan support, and its goals are consistent with the Great American Outdoors Act. By the way, the recent flood event in Louisiana—crystal ball—flooded homes in Mandeville and property in Grand Isle. If we have flooding

now, this bill would help prevent that flooding.

The COASTAL Act also places millions of dollars in a coastal fund, which benefits all coastal States, including those along the Great Lakes, putting money to protect where people live.

Once more, let me just show this. This is where people live, and 82 percent of the people live in a State with a coastline. Yet, where the money is going is, yes, to the coast, if you consider Washington, DC, and Virginia the coastline, but typically, it is going to five or six places, not to the places which have had the most flood events.

I walked around barrier islands in Georgia. Those barrier islands are evaporating. I hear that barrier islands in South Carolina are similarly under great duress. In Louisiana, as I already mentioned, we just had a flood event this past week. The COASTAL Act would put money for resiliency in States where 82 percent of the population lives. I just don't understand what is the objection to spending money to protect where people live. Why must we only do something nice for places where people vacation. If you put it to a referendum, people would first take care of their homes, and then they would take care of the place where they vacation.

I am not saying, by the way, don't take care of where they vacation, but I am saying we should at least give some dollars to where people live. Now, I will quote a statistic once more: 42 percent of Americans live in a parish or county that is directly on a shoreline. Why don't we do something to protect that shoreline where 42 percent of Americans live, not taking any dollars away from those sparsely populated places where people vacation?

By the way, when the COASTAL Act passed the Energy Committee, environmental groups such as the Energy Defense Fund, the National Wildlife Federation, Audubon Society, and Louisiana-based organizations such as the Lake Pontchartrain Basin Foundation and the Coalition to Restore Coastal Louisiana signed a letter saying:

As we move to address the significant land, water, and wildlife conservation funding needs in our Nation, it is important that our coastlines are also equipped to confront the unique challenges that climate change presents. GOMESA has been a critically important funding stream for Louisiana and other Gulf Coast States, and expanding upon this success will protect national economic assets, providing better protection from storms, and enhance coastal habitat.

Now, bill sponsors will, rightly, say that the Great American Outdoors Act does not impact revenues flowing to GOMESA States, but—let's face it—it does cannibalize these dollars in Louisiana, so sooner or later you run out of money.

So if we are going to take all these dollars that could be spent elsewhere and put in these sparsely populated States where people vacation but not spend it in States where people actually live, not spend it in counties where

42 percent of the people live, which are directly upon a coastline, sooner or later you run out of money. And we are going to—just like a vacuum cleaner—suck those dollars down to these sparsely populated areas where people love to vacation.

So my point is that, in Louisiana, for example, we have a \$50 billion, 50-year master plan to protect our coastline, reducing flood risk to communities and assets so important to the rest of the Nation. The Great American Outdoors Act will make it more difficult to secure future dollars for this gulf coast restoration.

Now, as I mentioned before, a lot of people live in coastline communities, in counties and parishes, and from 2000 to 2016, the Gulf of Mexico region grew by almost 25 percent, more than any other coastline region.

Harris County, TX, and areas in Florida and New York also accounted for substantial growth along our Nation's coast. The proposal I filed commits dollars to these coastal States so that they can have a sustainable revenue stream now and in the future for needed investments.

If you asked the people in New York, after Hurricane Sandy, if they would like to have dollars in New York to protect against a future flood event, they would say yes.

Houston and Galveston have really borne the brunt of major flood events, of hurricanes striking their coastline. Do we think that they could use more money for coastal resiliency? Yes—as well as Lake Charles, LA, after Hurricane Rita, Calcasieu Parish and Cameron Parish. We talked about Louisiana with Hurricane Katrina, the gulf coast of Mississippi and Alabama, devastated after Hurricane Katrina. Would it be wise, as a nation, to put dollars there in order to have coastal resiliency to prevent, if you will, more flooding in the future so as to actually save more relief dollars that might be needed?

There are people, there are regions, battling rising sea levels, and I am mindful about their concerns and how we can address those.

I am told recently, by the way, that the Army Corps of Engineers has proposed a \$3.5 billion flood wall for Miami. Think about that—\$3.5 billion. This is in response to rising sea levels. But we are passing legislation now in which folks refuse to consider spending money for coastal resiliency. Instead, we are going to spend money on a \$3.5 billion seawall because we don't want to spend the money on other forms of coastal resiliency.

I recently spoke to one of my House colleagues, DONNA SHALALA, who represents the Miami-Dade region, and she speaks about the rising sea levels and the investments they need to make around South Beach. It is something touching where people live, not where people vacation. I am not sure why we emphasize where people vacation over where people live.

To pay for this bill, again, we are taking dollars from an area of the country greatly impacted by coastal erosion, so these gulf funds actually play a role in restoring or maintaining—

You will see a poster later on which shows the oil and gas development taking place off the coast of Louisiana, the oil and gas development that funds the Great American Outdoors Act.

Louisiana's coast is a working coast in which people from this working coast go out to maintain that source of revenue, but look what is happening to Louisiana's predicted land loss. Over the next 50 years, in a reasonable scenario, all of this red spot will be lost to erosion.

By the way, look what happens to New Orleans. It is now directly along the Gulf of Mexico. The next hurricane comes, and there goes the port structure. There goes the ability for people in the Midwest to get their grains to the international market and the ability of this working coast to support the oil and gas drilling and, therefore, to support the source of revenue required and relied upon by the Great American Outdoors Act. It will be lost.

It is not just me saying it. Of course, I am the Senator. I love my State. I am going to do whatever I can. You may not believe me, but on the other hand, the State's land loss has been highlighted in countless feature stories, including in the New York Times and National Geographic, to name two.

By the way, Google Maps can't keep up. When looking at the Louisiana coastline, Google Maps will show an area with land that has now been replaced with open water. Louisiana loses about, oh, a football field of land, I think it is, an hour. Whenever I say it, I can't believe it, it is so fast. It is so rapid. So not only does this pose a risk to the energy assets, a risk to communities, and a risk to port assets; it poses a risk to our national livelihood.

Now, folks in Louisiana are going to look at this and say: How is the Great American Outdoors Act going to help us? We are going to work to produce all this oil and gas, and we are not going to get any of the benefits.

Senator KENNEDY and I recently had a call with more than 20 Louisiana parish presidents. They are, very understandably, concerned about the lack of equity. "Concerned" is diplomatic. "Ticked off" is how better to describe it.

I had another call with close to 100 businesses. They, too, are pleading for equitable treatment along the gulf.

So when I speak about the Great American Outdoors Act cannibalizing dollars from the Gulf of Mexico to spend money in places where people don't live as opposed to protecting my coastline, which, in turn, ensures that we can continue to have the source of revenue—but also coastlines around the Nation in counties and parishes where people actually live as opposed

to going to places where people only visit—I am trying to make a case for those people.

Will you show the energy assets.

I have been speaking about these energy assets that are required. It is one thing to say it; it is another thing to look at it. All of these are part of the gulf coast energy infrastructure that the rest of our Nation relies upon.

I am a doctor. I think like this. If you saw a map of the Nation, you would see pipelines coming out of this region across the rest of the Nation, and in my mind, as a doctor, I think of this as being a heart. If we need energy to fuel our lives, the heart is right here, and it beats here. The aorta, if you will, the pipelines that flow out, taking gasoline to Philadelphia, taking natural gas to another part of our country, taking the refined fuel products to Atlanta, GA, in the case of jet fuel—you name it, they come out of this area.

If this area cannot be sustained, we cannot sustain that part of our energy economy. We will not have jet flights to Hawaii or jet flights from Atlanta around the world, as the hub, or for New Orleans, people coming in for Mardi Gras, Jazz Fest, or to Breaux Bridge for a crawfish festival. It will not happen because this pipeline structure cannot be sustained with a coastline which is eroding.

Some of these—let me just speak—are oil import sites, natural gas market centers, processing facilities, liquefied natural gas export facilities, strategic petroleum reserve, major working ports, such as Port Fourchon. I could go on. These assets and companies then employ hundreds of thousands of men and women contributing billions of dollars in government revenues with an even greater impact on our annual GDP.

This is what powers our country. This is where the revenue is coming from for the Great American Outdoors Act. This revenue stream will not be sustainable if we don't at least have some consideration of how to restore this.

The Senator from Ohio had spoken about a leaky roof and the leaky roof increased its leak and now all those assets are being damaged within a park. That is great. People like to visit parks, and we should take care of leaky roofs. I am more concerned about a coastline that is dissolving, and, as it dissolves, you lose the energy infrastructure, which is required to pay for that park building to be fixed.

I will also point out the flooding risk for the folks in my State. Again, I spoke about the communities at risk. This is predicted future flooding from a 100-year flood event, without action. Let's just say, if it is colored, it is bad, where you are going to get 0.5 to 5 feet of water north of New Orleans.

If you want to speak about something that should be done now to prevent future problems, I have bigger issues than a leaky roof in a park

building. I have entire communities washed away into the ocean, at risk for great flooding. I am speaking of New Orleans. I could be speaking of Miami, of Houston, of New York.

Why don't we spend money where people live as opposed to spending it only where people vacation?

Now, you might be sitting in Iowa or Kansas or Nebraska thinking: Well, I am only getting 0.2 percent of this money. I am not getting any benefit whatsoever, but why does it matter to me to have a coastline? Why does it matter to me at all?

Well, let's look at how investing in the coast impacts our Nation economically. Let's look at what happened after Hurricane Katrina. After Hurricane Katrina, the flooding took out the port structure in South Louisiana; therefore, the in place for all the goods coming from the Ohio, Missouri, Mississippi, and other rivers for export to the rest of the world—the rest of the United States—was terribly impacted. If you look at this—if we have a lack of coastal investment—corn exports were down 23 percent post-Hurricane Katrina; barley, down 100 percent; wheat, down 54 percent; soy, down 25 percent; total grain exports, down 24 percent after Hurricane Katrina.

If that port system in South Louisiana and in the lower Calcasieu River in Houston is damaged by flooding—that is going to happen under current scenarios—then our midwestern farmers are not able to ship to international markets. Their livelihood is damaged.

In moving goods across our country for export, one coalition committed to ensuring future navigation on the Mississippi said that the lower Mississippi has an estimated annual impact of \$735 billion to the Nation's economy and is responsible for 2.4 million jobs. That starts with being able to navigate goods through the various locks and port complexes near the mouth of the river.

The USDA recognizes this. It says in a report on the importance of inland waterways that farm products are 14 percent of total commodities moved along inland waterways. Further, processed flour, animal feed, milled grain products, and fertilizers add another 5 percent to agricultural related products.

It is important to remember, the Mississippi River Valley encompasses almost 60 percent of our country, so many major rivers connect with the Mississippi to deliver those products around the world. If we are going to have a port system that is going to take those goods and allow them to be transported around the world, it has to be a sustained, reinforced coastline.

In my State, we have some of the largest barge and container ports in the country. The Port of South Louisiana is the largest grain exporter in the country. The Port of Baton Rouge is home to the largest grain operator in the State. Ports farther to the south in

Mobile and Texas are, likewise, important.

If we are going to have rising sea levels and spend all of our money on the inland areas—not where people live but where people visit on vacation—as opposed to the coastlines, which have the ports that sustain where people live and sustain the vitality of those in the heartland, we are being foolish with our public policy.

The same USDA report highlighted the consequences of an inadequate infrastructure along the waterways, saying that inadequate infrastructure leads to reduced transportation capacity, raising shipping rates, meaning less income to the farmers who are shipping—which reduces U.S. economic activity—and a loss of global competitiveness.

I could go on. I will just say that associated industries impacted by the Iowa grain exports support business from agriculture, forestry, real estate, restaurants, and pesticides, to name a few. This is just in Iowa.

The ports in the gulf coast support those folks in Iowa, and we should support the ports. We should support the ports, which support Iowa.

To summarize, my colleagues and I are fighting for fairness and equity. That is what this is about. I have highlighted obvious inequities both in how the gulf region is treated and how other States are treated—spending money not where people live but where people visit.

I am pointing out the consequences to midwestern farmers. They don't benefit very much at all—if you live in Iowa, Kansas, or Nebraska—from the Great American Outdoors Act, but they would benefit from a sustainable port system, which means that those ports they rely upon to ship goods around the world will be there even as sea levels rise.

Now, I am all for, by the way, taking care of deferred maintenance in parks, but I think, in the relative hierarchy of what we should do, we should take care of where people live. And I will repeat once more: 42 percent of the people live in a parish or county that is directly on a coastline; 82 percent of Americans live in a coastal State. That is not where the bulk of these dollars are spent.

We have a bipartisan group of Senators supporting; we have environmentally focused groups supporting as well, and what they are supporting is an amendment which would actually help create this equity that would allow dollars to be put into a fund to help coastal States—where people live—but would be part of a bill to take care of where people visit.

I wish it were the other way around, but those are not the priorities of the people who are promoting the Great American Outdoors Act.

I thank you for this time.

I yield the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

TRIBUTE TO DOREEN KRAFT

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, the last few months have presented an unprecedented challenge for communities and families across the country, and Vermont is no different. It is refreshing to take a moment to celebrate the people and entities that are at the foundation of our community identities. I want to take a moment to recognize one of these people in Vermont—Doreen Kraft—who was profiled in March for her leadership of Burlington City Arts.

For the past 25 years, Doreen has been the director of Burlington City Arts—BCA—a Burlington city department that promotes Vermont artists while supporting art exhibition, creation, and education. Doreen is an integral member of the Burlington city government and arts community. As described by Pat Robbins, the former BCA Center board chair, Doreen is “overcommitted . . . and always overscheduled, but she is a marvelous fundraiser. Everybody takes her calls. Everybody goes to lunch with her.” As the director of the BCA Center, Doreen has raised millions of dollars that have helped BCA further the arts in Burlington. Something that I most appreciate about Doreen is that she makes the arts accessible for all Vermonters. Jacqueline Posley, a BCA board member who relocated to our beautiful State from Mississippi, put it best by saying that Doreen fosters an environment at BCA that values people most for the connections they make in the community, rather than “by the depth of their pockets.” While she has led the BCA Center for 25 years, Doreen's work in Burlington began long before she was appointed director. In 1981, as the mayor of Burlington, now-Senator BERNIE SANDERS made the accessibility of the arts a priority, and Doreen became the first paid employee of the mayor's Task Force for the Arts. Doreen established a concert series in Burlington's Battery Park and the annual Burlington Discover Jazz Festival. By 1990, the task force had become a department of the city government, renamed Burlington City Arts. In 1995, the year Doreen was appointed as director, BCA opened its first gallery in the old Firehouse on Church Street, Burlington's main downtown area. Since then, the Firehouse Gallery and BCA have gained substantial recognition. With extensive fundraising and community investment, BCA renovated the Firehouse into a full visual arts center, renaming the gallery to BCA Center in 2011. Since 1995, the gallery has become a hub for visual arts in downtown Burlington, helping the city to become a destination known for its burgeoning arts scene, due in large part to Doreen's work as director.

Doreen has continued to expand the reach of BCA beyond Church Street. BCA recently purchased and began the

renovation of a 9,000-square-foot warehouse in Burlington's South End, a post-industrial neighborhood with its own indigenous art scene. While South End artists and businessowners initially saw the warehouse purchase as an encroachment by city government on their turf, relations have improved as collaboration between BCA and South End artists has grown, on issues of art promotion and city planning.

As renovation of the warehouse continues, I look forward to seeing how Doreen and Burlington City Arts can continue to give voice to new artists and perspectives, promoting not only the arts community but also greater conversation and cooperation between the government and the people it serves. With that, as we make decisions on how to assist our communities through this crisis, we must also remember the communities that we represent, and individuals that make our communities so remarkable. I want to recognize and thank Doreen Kraft, not only for her everlasting support of the arts, but as an ardent public servant whose efforts highlight the importance of community, equality, and accessibility.

I ask unanimous consent that her profile be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Seven Days, Mar. 11, 2020]

AFTER 40 YEARS AND FIVE MAYORS, DOREEN KRAFT STEERS BURLINGTON CITY ARTS INTO THE SOUTH END

(By Margaret Grayson)

Doreen Kraft doesn't really want to talk about Doreen Kraft. During a recent reception for new exhibitions at the BCA Center on Church Street, she preferred to direct a reporter's attention to everyone else in the room: a dedicated board member; Burlington's supportive mayor; the brilliant director of another local nonprofit.

Upstairs in her office, the longtime executive director of Burlington City Arts praised its successive gallery curators and explained how willing they had been to do hands-on work and volunteer extra time. She talked up a waitress at a restaurant that was partnering with BCA, who, unacquainted with Kraft, recently encouraged her to make a donation to the organization.

Kraft excels at this kind of schmoozing, probing and promoting at the same time. People describe her as a coach, an advocate, a great listener—essentially, who she is to other people, as if her role is to reflect the best version of everyone around her. It's an approach that has helped her grow BCA—through the administrations of five different mayors—from a janitor's closet in the basement of city hall to a municipal department charged with fostering public art and culture.

Since the organization's founding in 1980, Kraft, 68, has been a driving force. For the last 25 years, she's led BCA as it has created galleries and studios, developed art classes and summer camps, curated art in public spaces, won and distributed grants, and organized citywide events such as Festival of Fools and Highlight, Burlington's New Year's Eve celebration. The city contributes a portion of the funds for those cultural activities.

Kraft raises at least half of the rest of the money single-handedly. Most recently, she

spearheaded the purchase of a building at 405 Pine Street that now houses the organization's art studios. Kraft and her team need to find \$5 million to renovate it.

"She gets overcommitted. She's always overscheduled. But she's a marvelous fundraiser," said Pat Robins, cofounder of the Church Street Marketplace and former BCA board chair. "Everybody takes her calls. Everybody goes to lunch with her."

Jacqueline Posley, a recent transplant to Vermont by way of the state's Stay to Stay program, joined the BCA board last June. She said that in her home state of Mississippi, she felt the arts were only for people with money. At BCA, she said she felt valued more for her willingness to make connections in the community than the depth of her pockets. She describes Kraft as an inclusive and unpretentious leader.

"Doreen will put out the food trays, will sweep the floors," Posley said. "Every job that needs to be done, I could see Doreen doing it."

Robins credited BCA's long-running success with Kraft's ability to take risks and, more importantly, pull them off. If this story were a documentary, there'd be short takes of nearly a dozen Burlington leaders all saying the same thing: BCA would not exist today without Kraft, despite her attempts to redirect the spotlight. When BCA is praised, Kraft's name is attached. When it's criticized, she is often targeted personally.

This particular arts job also comes with political perils. BCA is an arm of city government and whoever happens to be running it, and Kraft is, technically, an annual appointee of the mayor. She navigates it all with a highly developed sense of direction and diplomacy.

"I love to see and engage with people who believe that the arts are central to community life," Kraft said. "And if I can be a part of that process and move that forward and make that more possible and attainable, then my heart sings." She's deeply loyal to Burlington: "I cannot imagine doing this anywhere else."

Working the gallery opening at the BCA Center, Kraft noticed immediately when Mayor Miro Weinberger walked in. She asked her boss if he'd be willing to speak to the crowd, then jumped into action to corral all the featured artists and curators to start speeches before he had to leave, and gave a glowing, on-the-spot introduction praising Weinberger's support for BCA.

It was a calculated move on Kraft's part, honed from decades of experience. But her words, delivered in a loud but warm New York-accented alto, rang totally authentic.

GOVERNMENT STARTUP

When he became mayor of Burlington in 1981, Bernie Sanders had an agenda. On it was a desire to "make the arts more accessible to all, regardless of social, economic or physical constraints." But he faced a powerful board of aldermen, known today as the Burlington City Council, who stymied his attempts to hire staff and appoint department heads.

So Sanders created the Community and Economic Development Office, along with a youth office and the Mayor's Task Force on the Arts, to circumvent the board of aldermen's control.

Kraft was appointed to the cultural task force and became its first paid employee in 1983, working out of a closet-size office. Soon known as the Mayor's Arts Council, the group started a concert series in Battery Park and cofounded the Burlington Discover Jazz Festival with the Flynn Center for the Performing Arts in 1985.

In 1990, the Mayor's Arts Council became an official city department, renamed Bur-

lington City Arts. Kraft was on the board at the time but didn't become executive director until 1995. Like Fletcher Free Library, BCA derived only a portion of its budget from taxpayers. Today, it gets 40 percent of its \$2.2 million operating budget from the city and 60 percent from philanthropy and outside grants.

Kraft had the requisite fundraising skills to make that arrangement workable. As it turned out, she also had a knack for recruiting young talent.

When Pascal Spengemann came to Burlington in 1995, planning to stay for only a few months, he saw BCA's Firehouse Gallery on Church Street and thought it was cool that there was art on Burlington's main drag. BCA had converted the ground floor of the historic firehouse into a gallery that same year. Through the windows, he saw makeshift walls and paintings hung with fishing line.

But one day during business hours, Spengemann went by and the space was closed. So he went next door to city hall, found Kraft, and convinced her to hire him to supervise the gallery and keep its doors open.

Spengemann lobbied to take over the curatorial duties, and after he put on a well-received test-run show, Kraft let him take the reins.

"I was pretty green and looking for something to do, and she really believed in me," Spengemann said. "I felt really supported by her."

Under his supervision, the Firehouse Gallery began to gain recognition. In 1998, the Burlington City Council approved a proposal to renovate the old firehouse building into a visual arts center, and the newly formed BCA Foundation launched its first capital campaign. In 2004 the renovation was finished, and in 2011 it was renamed the BCA Center.

Today, curator Heather Ferrell cites receiving grants from the Andy Warhol Foundation for the Visual Arts as evidence that the BCA Center is respected in the broader contemporary art community. Many considerations go into the shows the BCA Center puts on throughout the year. Ferrell said they aim for various levels of "accessibility," meaning how much interpretation to add so people can understand and enjoy the work, and how much to challenge the audience.

She also tries to balance showing Vermont artists and national artists, and integrating the two rather than having a separate gallery for Vermonters as was done in the past. For example, local artist Stella Marrs guest-curated the current main-floor exhibit, "Apocalypse Diet," at the BCA Center, featuring Vermont and national artists.

Sara Katz started working at BCA in 1999, but it was after she volunteered to help out in Kraft's garden that she got to know the director. The two chatted, pulled weeds and began what is now a 20-year working relationship.

"She's curious about people," said Katz, who has since become the organization's assistant director. "I was just, like, a 22-year-old nobody at that time, and she wanted to know how I thought."

Today, Katz is BCA's behind-the-scenes force, making sure administrative tasks are handled so Kraft has time to be the face of the organization.

"You know, she's just this kind of public dynamo," Katz said. "She's really incredible with human relationships. She just understands people in a really intuitive way, so it makes a lot of sense for her to be out in the world as much as possible."

FILMMAKER TO RAINMAKER

Kraft grew up in New Rochelle, N.Y., and majored in studio art at the University of

New Mexico. But, unsure what to do after graduation, she fell in with "a group of merry pranksters," she said. Kraft moved to a farm in Bethel, VT, as part of the back-to-the-land movement. Though she enjoys gardening, she admitted it was a hard year.

"There was just no question I was not cut out to be a farmer," Kraft said.

She started teaching an art class at a local high school and met Robin Lloyd, who was teaching in nearby Rochester. Lloyd was making films, which Kraft had never done before. But they started working together, and Lloyd taught her the medium. They both moved to Burlington, into the house on Maple Street where Lloyd still lives today, and Kraft went back to school at the University of Vermont, studying film production in the communications department. (She also did stints at Nova Scotia College of Art and Design and Hampshire College.)

Kraft and Lloyd were both influenced by the work of Maya Deren, an experimental filmmaker whose work focused on Haitian vodou. In 1973 the two took the first of many trips to Haiti, where they made a short film about the country's colorful painted buses.

Later, Kraft and Lloyd commissioned local artists to make paintings that they then used in a 20-minute stop-motion animated film, called "Black Dawn," exploring Haitian history. The French government bought copies for all of its embassies; Kraft said it's the only movie of hers that has ever made money. She and Lloyd founded a production company called Green Valley Media in 1974; Kraft still sits on the board.

Kraft also embarked on more personal filmmaking projects, including a re-enactment of her mother's childhood in a convent school in Ireland. Kraft called that still-unfinished work her "film in a can." She'd like to edit it someday, but "it's not something you can do on a weekend," she noted. "I mean, I would need a sabbatical, and they don't have sabbaticals in the arts."

In a way, making films helped prepare Kraft for her job at BCA. "In the early days . . . I would be petrified of being onstage or, you know, introducing concerts at Battery Park," she said. "People would push me out there."

"If you have a camera and a microphone, you have an excuse to pretty much ask a lot of questions and get to talk to people," Kraft said. Still, she added, "There are days that I go an entire day and literally, when I get home, I can't speak. I'm, like, done. I have to go through that quiet time, listen to music, listen to news, just transition out of the day and also reflect."

Kraft lives in East Charlotte with her husband, artist Marvin Fishman, whom she met making films. The couple is thinking of moving back to Burlington, where Kraft hasn't lived since the 1990s. If they do it, she said, she'd actually miss the commute, which marks a defined transition between her job and her home.

Kraft doesn't always achieve work-life balance. Most recently, she has lost sleep over the purchase of the new building on Pine Street. A walk through the empty warehouse that BCA now owns—9,000 square feet of which will be converted into new studio space and a community room—reveals just what a mammoth task this renovation will be. Especially when you factor in BCA's commitment to making the building net zero in energy consumption. Kraft said she hopes to get it done in three years.

She's already started giving tours of the building and reaching out to potential donors. "She's very good at establishing the vision, and she's very good at then asking for people to support it," said Chris Thompson, a former BCA Center curator and former executive director of Generator maker space.

"Having done a lot of fundraising myself recently," he added, it taught him that "you have to believe passionately in the mission. And if you believe strongly enough in the mission, you're willing to ask anybody for anything."

SOUTH END 'PLAN'

Kraft has often been compared to another local woman who built a thriving arts organization: Andrea Rogers. She was the founding executive director of the Flynn, instrumental in transitioning it from a moribund movie theater to a restored art-deco performing arts center. Rogers ran the Flynn for 29 years before retiring in 2010.

BCA focused on the visual arts because it was underrepresented in Burlington's arts scene. Avoiding duplication of the Flynn's performing arts programming and classes was helpful to what Rogers described as a "good working relationship" with BCA, citing their collaboration in producing the annual Burlington Discover Jazz Festival.

"We were both dedicated to our own institutions," Rogers said. "There's no question about that. And I think, because we were early leaders of our institutions, the both of us could be charged with being too protective of our own kingdoms. I'm sure I was considered that, and she probably has been, too."

It's a diplomatic way of acknowledging that Burlington's arts community has seen some turf battles over the years. BCA has run into resistance from the artists and business owners along the Pine Street corridor—later dubbed the South End Arts District—who were protective of their neighborhood and fiercely opposed to any development that might threaten scarce, affordable studio space. They rallied behind the South End Arts and Business Association, which created and still organizes Burlington's annual South End Art Hop.

Whether or not it was warranted, some believed that BCA—and, by extension, Kraft—wanted to stake a claim in the South End, perhaps because of the organization's city-department status.

That came to a head with planBTV. In June 2015, the city released a draft of a plan to redevelop the South End—the postindustrial area of Burlington along Pine Street and Flynn Avenue. BCA, with the help of a National Endowment for the Arts grant, recruited artists to create works that would engage the public and solicit comments on the proposed plan.

But in August, many of those artists became disenchanted with the process and didn't think their voices had been heard. They worried that a proposed zoning change to allow more housing in the area would displace them, and they believed BCA was complicit.

Amey Radcliffe, one of the artists who received funding for a community engagement project, put it this way in a recent email to Seven Days: "I don't necessarily feel that the artist/activists that emerged at that time were fully heard or fully understood. If BCA were less under the purview of the Mayor, we might see BCA taking more independent stands and actions—less in-step with the Mayor's development agendas for the area."

Signs began to appear around the neighborhood, according to local media reports, including ones that read, "BCA: Will you stand with the arts community to preserve industrial zoning in the SEAD?" At that year's South End Art Hop in September, artists built a temporary cardboard house across the street from ArtsRiot that was dubbed "Miroville."

Kraft was also the subject of some Art Hop protest art. One of the buildings in the How-

ard Space—the warren of artist studios at Pine and Howard streets—was topped with a large sculpture depicting Weinberger holding puppet versions of Kraft and the city's director of planning, David White, on strings.

"I tried to buy it," Kraft said of the artwork. "I stood there that night, and I remember saying to people, 'I do get this. I understand it, you know? I'll take the criticism.' But I also felt that BCA was misunderstood, and our role in that planning."

Relations have improved since then. SEABA's current executive director, Christy Mitchell, said she's excited to have another organization with a stake in the South End and sees BCA as a potential ally in getting new signage and maps pointing tourists to Pine Street. Radcliffe said she thought the perception of BCA in the area was generally positive and that the purchase of the building on Pine Street could provide new opportunities for South End artists.

Steve Conant, owner of Conant Metal & Light and the Soda Plant—and an early member of SEABA—said he'd been aware of a "turf war" between the two organizations, though not when he was directly involved. "It's hard to complain about an organization that anchors 30,000 square feet of real estate and commits it to the arts," Conant said. "That's the biggest risk in the South End: the loss of real estate that supports the arts."

BCA's relationship with the city is a double-edged sword. On one hand, it provides the organization with a significant portion of its budget, covering staff and overhead costs. It also provides easy connections with other city departments and a larger stake in city decision making. On the other hand, the public money opens the organization up to criticism about how those funds are used. Dissatisfaction with Weinberger generally casts a shadow on his appointees.

Kraft, one of the original members of the Sanders administration, has another challenge: walking a line between the passionate, activist tendencies of the community and the bureaucratic nature of city government.

John Franco, once Sanders' assistant city attorney, has represented opponents of the Weinberger administration in court; Steve Goodkind, another original Sanders appointee who headed up the Department of Public Works, ran against Weinberger in 2015. Among the original group of Bernie acolytes that former Seven Days columnist Peter Freyne called the "inner circle of Sanderistas," Kraft is the only one still on the city payroll.

Lloyd is a longtime peace activist in Vermont and said that has led to friendly disagreements between her and Kraft. For example, BCA's annual Festival of Fools often lands on the August anniversary of the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in World War II.

"I said, 'OK, Doreen, you're having a Festival of Fools, but I'm going to walk down Church Street with ashes on my head impersonating what happened in Hiroshima many years ago,'" Lloyd described with a laugh.

Because of their long-standing friendship, Lloyd said, she and Kraft can usually work out a deal when their interests collide. In the case of the Festival of Fools, Lloyd planned her demonstration on the waterfront after the last festival act had performed there.

The women agree to disagree on other controversial city projects, too, such as the long-planned and much-delayed construction of the Champlain Parkway through the South End.

"She's a very loyal person for what she gets involved with," Lloyd said. "I think she's a vital person for Miro, because she has contacts with a lot of people he might not have within the arts community and with the alternative community."

Lots of people confide in Kraft. "Not that she gossips," said Lloyd, "but she could certainly do a lot of gossiping if she wanted to."

"I'm just pretty open and honest with people," Kraft said. "Not that we haven't had knock-down, drag-out debate on certain issues, you know, but I think people respect my role in the city and that you can't have another identity outside of BCA. It's just not possible. I can be active in causes, but I certainly can't take sides, because Burlington City Arts has to be neutral. . . . I don't think I hold back on my opinion; I just use it appropriately."

Kraft said the BCA board has considered, multiple times, whether staying associated with the city is the best path forward.

"We've gone through that exercise to sort of really look at ourselves at that time and to analyze the relationship with the city," Kraft said. "There have been mayors who said, 'You know, it's a good exercise, because are we holding you back from becoming something you could be more of if you weren't associated with the city?'"

But the answer, Kraft said, is always no—the benefits always outweigh the costs. BCA's new Pine Street studio space proves her point.

"We would not exist if it wasn't for the platform of the city," she said. "Either we wouldn't exist or we'd be a completely independent nonprofit that probably would have accomplished a quarter of what we've accomplished today. I think we stand on the shoulders of the city for what we've done."

RECOGNIZING VOLUNTEERS IN MARSHFIELD AND PLAINFIELD

Mr LEAHY. Madam President, the public health and economic crisis that has gripped the country since March has been a challenge everywhere, and Vermont is no different; yet it should surprise no one that Vermonters rise to the moment. As businesses shuttered and Vermonters adhered to our State's stay-at-home orders, a group of 20 or so Vermonters stepped up to volunteer to bring groceries, medications, or other essential items for their neighbors and friends in Marshfield and Plainfield.

The effect was organized by the enrichment coordinator for Montpelier's public schools, Drew McNaughton, who stepped up, utilizing Front Porch Forum, coordinating a group of volunteers to help bring goods to those staying at home. It is "a natural thing to do," Drew said, and he could not be more right: It is natural for Vermonters to step up to help other Vermonters. It has always been the Vermont way. And it is why together we are Vermont strong.

I ask unanimous consent that an article highlighting this volunteer effort, which appeared in the Times Argus in March, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Times Argus, Mar. 20, 2020]

VOLUNTEERS OFFERING DELIVERIES FOR THOSE ISOLATED IN MARSHFIELD AND PLAINFIELD

(By Eric Blaisdell)

MARSHFIELD.—More than 20 residents in the area have volunteered to help get people groceries or medication in response to the novel coronavirus pandemic.

Drew McNaughton is the enrichment coordinator for Montpelier's public schools. Schools across the state have shut down due to the virus that causes COVID-19. So McNaughton has been working from home.

While at home he's decided to help organize a group of volunteers in the Marshfield and Plainfield areas who can go to stores to pick up items for those who may not be able. "It seemed like the natural thing to do. It seems like a natural response for a community to take care of the vulnerable populations," he said.

Health officials have said those that are older, have chronic health conditions or have a compromised immune system are most at risk from the virus. People are being told to stay home as much as they can and to stay at least six feet away from others in effort to keep the virus from spreading. Some who have tested positive for the virus or are showing symptoms are being told to stay home and self-isolate for 14 days.

McNaughton has been promoting the effort on Front Porch Forum and so far 22 people have signed up to volunteer. Those who volunteered have agreed to share their contact information with those looking for items to be delivered.

So far he said there's only been one request for delivery: a resident who needed heart medication. But McNaughton believes that will change the longer this goes on and the stricter the isolation requirements during the pandemic.

"There's going to be more people sheltering in place and it's going to be up to the healthy and the young to step up for once. The millennials are going to be facing an actual challenge," he said.

He said one of the hard parts about the pandemic is the anxiety people are feeling due to the uncertainty of how long this will go on with no defined end date.

"To me, that's the unnerving part," he said.

To help pass the time, he said he's been doing projects around the house and doing things outside. He said he would bet plenty of people will have renovation projects completed by themselves by the time this is all over.

"A lot of amateur carpenters are going to emerge," he said.

TRIBUTE TO DWIGHT GARDNER

Mr. BENNET. Madam President, I rise to honor the career of Dwight Gardner, who recently announced his retirement after providing decades of service to the State of Colorado. He most recently served on my staff as the regional director for southeast Colorado. Dwight has been a tireless advocate for the farmers, ranchers, and communities across our State. For decades, he has worked on behalf of communities throughout the region, from Pueblo to Raton Pass on the New Mexico border, and from the headwaters of the Arkansas River in Leadville, high in the Rockies, to the town of Holly in Prowers County.

Early in his career, Dwight worked alongside his brother to support the farmers of the Arkansas Valley as a cropduster. Living through the era of "buy and dry" land purchasing to divert water to meet the needs of a growing Front Range, Dwight understood early the value of advocacy for rural Colorado.

In 2000, he was elected to the first of two terms as a Crowley County Commissioner, and in that role, he was selected as chairman of the Southern Colorado Economic Development District to represent the interests of the 14 counties in the region. In 2007, my predecessor, Senator Ken Salazar, asked Dwight to join his office. I was fortunate that Dwight agreed to continue his service in my office in 2009.

Dwight employs a formidable array of skills to serve the southeast region of Colorado effectively. He builds strong relationships with people; he possesses a deep knowledge and respect for the heritage of Colorado; and he provides a constant presence when the issues demand it. He has engaged in the battle for Federal funds to build the long-promised Arkansas Valley conduit. He was witness to the important preservation of our national heritage at Camp Amache and Sand Creek. He helped shepherd the critical economic opportunity represented by the continuation of the Southwest Chief railroad line.

From local food production to manufacturing, from the decommissioning of the Pueblo Chemical Depot to establishing good neighbor relations at Fort Carson's Pinon Canyon Maneuver site, Dwight has been a steady presence and road warrior as he has advanced the common good across hundreds of miles of beautiful southern Colorado.

Going forward, I will miss Dwight's humility, his candor, and his keen understanding of what it means to be a son of rural America, attributes so needed as we work our way toward a better future. I am comforted to know that the next generation, represented by his grandsons Noah, Devlan, and Gatlan, have the benefit of his guidance. Colorado is grateful for his service.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO KARA FOUR BEAR

• Mr. CRAMER. Madam President, I want to congratulate Kara Four Bear, the principal at the New Town, ND, Middle School, for being one of two educators in the Nation to be presented with the Presidential Cybersecurity Education Award.

The U.S. Department of Education received nominations for 43 educators from 23 States for this inaugural award. Kara Four Bear's selection was based on her passion for developing digital literacy and safety skills in her students and then helping them make real-world connections with what they learn.

She has led her school in establishing robust, global, and relevant education programs using curriculum provided from the National Integrated Education Research Center. This curriculum challenges students to put into practical use their lessons in topics such as cyber ethics and cyber law.

They start this curriculum as sixth graders and continue through middle school and high school. Through various class projects and State, regional, and national competitions, they explore science, technology, engineering, and mathematics and the careers available in these fields.

This Presidential Cybersecurity Education Award was established on May 2, 2019, by President Trump's executive order on America's Cybersecurity Workforce. The Department of Education was charged with creating this award within 1 year and in consultation with the Deputy Assistant to the President for Homeland Security and Counterterrorism at the National Security Council and the National Science Foundation.

Because the demand for STEM careers continues to grow in my State, our Nation, and around the world, there is a critical need for students to excel in these subjects. Because women continue to be underrepresented in careers focusing on computer science and cybersecurity, the challenge is even greater to encourage girls to develop the creative thinking and problem-solving skills needed in these careers at an early age.

The New Town students joined young North Dakota women from Bismarck, Fargo, Grand Forks, West Fargo, Sheyenne, and Williston schools last month in the Girls Go CyberStart competition, sponsored by the SANS Institute. North Dakota had the highest nationwide participation per capita for the second year in a row, and I commend all who participated in this competition.

Inspirational educators like Kara Four Bear are leading the way to increase opportunities for North Dakota students to prepare for careers in the field of cybersecurity. I thank her for her passion for cyber education and for being an inspiration to what can be done to successfully create this level of excellence in schools across the Nation.●

RECOGNIZING GOOD SHEPHERD HOUSING AND FAMILY SERVICES

• Mr. KAINE. Madam President, the formation, development, growth and success of Good Shepherd Housing and Family Services, GSH is a story that exemplifies the very best in people-to-people programs. Started in 1974 as a "helping hand" volunteer-run organization by members of the Mount Vernon community, including several churches and local businesses, the founders of GSH established a volunteer board of directors to steer the organization's efforts to help those experiencing homelessness in the Greater Mount Vernon community.

Today, GSH is a vital affordable housing and services provider with a 10-person professional staff and a \$2.7 million operating budget. GSH remains true to its founding vision and mission. GSH works every day to reduce homelessness and enable self-sufficiency by

providing permanent affordable rental housing, emergency financial services, budget counseling, and case management to hundreds of working families in Fairfax County. Then, as now, GSH helps struggling families create and sustain a better way of life for themselves and their neighbors.

In 1975, GSH acquired its first property on Holland Road, built and furnished a home, and moved in a struggling refugee family of nine and began providing them ongoing support services, starting them on the path towards self-sufficiency and housing stability. Two months later, several Laotian and Vietnamese refugee families received housing assistance upon their arrival in the community. For the next several years, GSH continued to serve families and individuals needing housing and emergency financial assistance. Under the leadership of its board, GSH functioned solely with the support of volunteers and individual donations.

Today, with its affordable rental housing portfolio of 100-plus leased and owned units, as many as 120 struggling families are housed and supported every year in GSH housing. GSH's emergency financial assistance program assists an additional 200 households a year by preventing evictions or providing security deposits. GSH case managers also provide service referrals to another 200-plus households each year to receive community services to address their healthcare, transportation, and food needs.

Additional support services and programs are offered to move resident household to greater self-sufficiency. The Children's Resources Program supports the 110-plus schoolchildren residing in GSH affordable housing units and ensures their educational needs are met. Various financial counseling programs help low-income female heads of household create a healthy consciousness around money and empowers them to begin to establish financial security.

A president/chief executive officer, vice president/chief operating officer, financial manager, and development director lead the day-to-day operations of GSH. They are assisted by staff of six full- and part-time employees. A 16-member board of directors oversees its work, while a leadership council of 23 key community stakeholders in the service area provides advice and guidance on the needs and human services trends within the community and the impact of GSH programs in meeting those needs.

The current service area lies within the Mount Vernon and Lee Districts of South Fairfax County, mainly along Richmond Highway from Alexandria to Lorton, where many low-income workers live. The deepest pockets of poverty in Fairfax County are here. For example, according to 2016 U.S. Census Bureau data, 66,618 people 5.9 percent or 1 in 17 Fairfax County live in poverty i.e., below the Federal poverty level of \$24,600 per year for a family of four. Based on census data disaggregated at

the ZIP code and neighborhood level, several of the neighborhoods in the GSH service area report that 10 to 15 percent of their households live in poverty.

For more than 45 years, Good Shepherd Housing and Family Services has had one outcome in mind: to ensure that the households it serves reach housing stability, build financial resources, and never face the possibility or reality of homelessness. Every year, GSH programs stretch and grow to make this outcome a reality for its residents. Recently, several local Northern Virginia and Metropolitan Washington, DC, agencies recognized the affordable housing contributions of GSH through grant awards that help finance the programs. As the need for its services unfortunately continues to grow at a staggering pace, GSH will continue to step up, lend a helping hand, and empower its clients to do the same.●

RECOGNIZING PINECREST BAKERY

● Mr. RUBIO. Madam President, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship, each week I recognize a small business that exemplifies the American entrepreneurial spirit at the heart of our country. It is my privilege to recognize a family-owned small business that is not only a Miami staple, but has helped feed thousands of Floridians impacted by the coronavirus pandemic. This week, it is my pleasure to honor Pinecrest Bakery, of Pinecrest, FL, as the Senate Small Business of the Week.

In 2012, Efrain Valdes and Joel Rodriguez founded Pinecrest Bakery. Years earlier, these longtime friends met in Miami's Little Havana and formed a bond over their shared Cuban heritage and love for its cuisine. When Efrain's family moved to Pinecrest, he noticed a lack of Cuban restaurants in their new neighborhood. Seeing this as an opportunity, Efrain and Joel opened the original Pinecrest Bakery in December 2012. Their welcoming atmosphere and delicious food proved a hit, with lines regularly forming out the door. Soon, Pinecrest Bakery expanded its hours to become Miami's premier 24-hour Cuban bakery.

Eight years later, Pinecrest Bakery expanded to 17 locations, with 3 more on the way. Their original menu of Cuban coffee and pastries now includes meal and catering menus and a food truck. Pinecrest Bakery is earning accolades for its delicious cuisine and emerging as a leader in the local business community. The business remains family-owned, with several members of the Valdes and Rodriguez families serving in key leadership and food production roles. Additionally, their strong sense of family has built a tight-knit and supportive team.

Like many other small businesses, Pinecrest Bakery stepped up to help their community during the coronavirus pandemic. The shortage of

essential goods in stores prompted them to sell their bulk supplies of milk and eggs directly to customers. In mid-March, Pinecrest Bakery ramped up their existing partnership with Farm Share, a nonprofit organization that connects Floridian farmers with surplus produce to local businesses and organizations for distribution. Using its Pinecrest location as a distribution center, Pinecrest Bakery provided approximately 200,000 pounds of free food to nearly 10,000 families in south Florida. The American Legion recognized Pinecrest for donating hot meals to healthcare workers and first responders.

When the U.S. Small Business Administration launched the Paycheck Protection Program—PPP—Efrain and Joel applied immediately. The PPP provides forgivable loans to impacted small businesses and nonprofits who maintain their payroll during the COVID-19 pandemic. Recently, Pinecrest Bakery received their PPP loan, which has enabled them to keep their employees paid and continue their work to feed south Florida.

Pinecrest Bakery is a remarkable example of how small businesses can leverage local connections to support their communities in times of crisis. I commend their work with Farm Share and leadership in the Miami area.

Congratulations to Efrain, Joel, and the entire team at Pinecrest Bakery. I look forward to watching your continued growth and success in south Florida.●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-4750. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Autographa Californica Multiple Nucleopolyhedrovirus Strain R3; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance" (FRL No. 10005-93-OCSP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 18, 2020; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC-4751. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Real Estate Appraisals" (RIN1557-AE86) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4752. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rule: Revised Transaction of the Current Expected Credit Losses Methodology for Allowances" (RIN1557-AE82) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4753. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of

the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rule: Revised Transition of the Current Expected Credit Losses Methodology for Allowances; Correction" (RIN1557-AE87) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4754. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rule: Transition for the Community Bank Leverage Ratio Framework" (RIN1557-AE89) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4755. A communication from the Program Specialist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Capital Rule: Temporary Changes to the Community Bank Leverage Ratio Framework" (RIN1557-AE88) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2020; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-4756. A communication from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting, pursuant to law, two (2) reports relative to vacancies in the Office of Management and Budget, received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 21, 2020; to the Committees on the Budget; and Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4757. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a legislative proposal entitled "Amend Section 621(d) of the Department of Energy (DOE) Organization Act"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4758. A communication from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, a legislative proposal entitled "Amend Section 4601(c) of the Atomic Energy Defense Act"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-4759. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Indiana; Redesignation of the Indianapolis Sulfur Dioxide Non-attainment Area" (FRL No. 10008-35-Region 5) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 4, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4760. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "TSCA Chemical Data Reporting Revisions under TSCA Section 8(a)" (FRL No. 10005-56-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 18, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4761. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Chemical Data Reporting; Extension of the 2020 Submission Period" (FRL No. 10006-39-OCSPP) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on May 18, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4762. A communication from the Director of the Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Air Plan Approval; Ohio; Revisions to NOx SIP Call Rules" (FRL No. 10007-21-Region 5) received in the Office of the President

of the Senate on May 18, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4763. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Enforcement, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Enforcement Guidance Memorandum 20-002; Dispositioning Violations of NRC Requirements Under 10 CFR Parts 30-36, and 39, Resulting from Impacts of the COVID-19 Public Health Emergency (PHE), Where the Licensee Suspended the Use of Licensed Material and Placed Material in Safe Storage" (RIN3150-A112) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 2, 2020; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-4764. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the authorization of danger pay in Chile; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-4765. A communication from the Assistant Secretary, Employee Benefits Security Administration, Department of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Default Electronic Disclosure by Employee Pension Benefit Plans Under ERISA" (RIN1210-AB90) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 1, 2020; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-4766. A communication from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2019 through March 31, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4767. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Department's Semiannual Report of the Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2019 through March 31, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4768. A communication from the Director, General Counsel and Legal Policy Division, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Technical Updating Amendments to Executive Branch Financial Disclosure and Standards of Ethical Conduct Regulations" (RIN3209-AA52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4769. A communication from the Director, General Counsel and Legal Policy Division, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Post-Employment Conflict of Interest Restrictions; Revision of Department Component Designations" (RIN3209-AA52) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 4, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4770. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Employees Health Benefits Acquisition Regulations: Self Plus One and Contract Matrix Update" (RIN3206-AN56) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on June 8, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

EC-4771. A communication from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Agency's Semiannual Report of the Office of Inspector General for the period from October 1, 2019 through March 31, 2020; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2618. A bill to strengthen employee cost savings suggestions programs within the Federal Government (Rept. No. 116-231).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE

The following executive report of a nomination was submitted:

By Ms. MURKOWSKI for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*Mark Wesley Menezes, of Virginia, to be Deputy Secretary of Energy.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ROUNDS (for himself, Ms. SMITH, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. HYDE-SMITH, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 3917. A bill to establish a home-based telemental health care demonstration program for purposes of increasing mental health services in rural medically underserved populations and for individuals in farming, fishing, and forestry occupations; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 3918. A bill to modify the calculation of the maximum loan amount for certain farmers and ranchers under the paycheck protection program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

By Ms. SINEMA (for herself and Mr. COTTON):

S. 3919. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program to pre-program suicide prevention resources into smart devices issued to members of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. COTTON (for himself and Mrs. BLACKBURN):

S. 3920. A bill to secure the research enterprise of the United States from the Chinese Communist Party, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. SANDERS:

S. 3921. A bill to require the Federal Government to provide critical health care resources in response to the COVID-19 pandemic; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. PAUL:

S. 3922. A bill to establish Federal Regulatory Review Commissions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. MANCHIN, and Ms. SINEMA):

S. 3923. A bill to provide emergency relief to youth, children, and families experiencing

homelessness, in light of the health and economic consequences of COVID-19; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 3924. A bill to provide tax credits to low-to moderate-income individuals for certain computer and education costs, to direct the Federal Communications Commission to modify the requirements for the Lifeline program to provide increased support, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BLUMENTHAL (for himself and Mr. BROWN):

S. 3925. A bill to protect the entitlement of individuals to Post-9/11 Educational Assistance who discontinue pursuit of a program of education during the national emergency relating to the COVID-19 pandemic, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. COTTON, and Mr. LANKFORD):

S. 3926. A bill to amend the FAST Act to improve the Federal permitting process, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CRUZ (for himself, Mr. LANKFORD, and Mr. COTTON):

S. 3927. A bill to establish a 90-day limit to file a petition for judicial review of a permit, license, or approval for a highway or public transportation project, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mrs. LOEFFLER:

S. Res. 612. A resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the tragic death of George Floyd was unjust and the perpetrators must stand trial and be brought to justice, the First Amendment of the Constitution guarantees individuals the right to peaceably assemble and protest, groups like Antifa and the individuals who took over peaceful protests with violence, chaos, looting, and destruction should be held accountable for their actions, the attacks on law enforcement, individuals, small businesses, and communities are causing death, injury and millions of dollars in damage, the vast majority of men and women in law enforcement work tirelessly and risk their lives to protect the people of the United States without prejudice, police departments are the cornerstone for maintaining a society of order, calls to defund the police threaten the safety and security of the people of the United States, Congress will continue to appropriate funding to local law enforcement agencies that bolster police efforts, and the Nation must come together in healing, reconciliation, and prayer to reaffirm that every life is sacred, our society must strive for equality, and that we will work to ensure a tragedy like George Floyd's never happens again in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 800

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. HAWLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 800, a bill to establish a postsecondary student data system.

S. 939

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr.

GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 939, a bill to establish limitations regarding Confucius Institutes, and for other purposes.

S. 1306

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. KAINE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1306, a bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, and the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, and for other purposes.

S. 1620

At the request of Mr. KING, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. DAINES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1620, a bill to amend the Federal Meat Inspection Act to exempt from inspection the slaughter of animals and the preparation of carcasses conducted at a custom slaughter facility, and for other purposes.

S. 2417

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2417, a bill to provide for payment of proceeds from savings bonds to a State with title to such bonds pursuant to the judgment of a court.

S. 2546

At the request of Ms. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2546, a bill to amend the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require a group health plan or health insurance coverage offered in connection with such a plan to provide an exceptions process for any medication step therapy protocol, and for other purposes.

S. 3600

At the request of Mr. COTTON, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3600, a bill to authorize the imposition of sanctions with respect to the deliberate concealment or distortion of information about public health emergencies of international concern, and for other purposes.

S. 3605

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3605, a bill to amend the Specialty Crops Competitiveness Act of 2004 to provide specialty crop block grants to fund State food banks and food access networks.

S. 3638

At the request of Mr. SULLIVAN, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3638, a bill to allow Coronavirus Relief Fund payments to be used to replace revenue shortfalls resulting from COVID-19.

S. 3722

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Sen-

ator from Texas (Mr. CORNYN), the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND), the Senator from Georgia (Mrs. LOEFFLER), the Senator from Washington (Ms. CANTWELL), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ROUNDS), the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) were added as cosponsors of S. 3722, a bill to authorize funding for a bilateral cooperative program with Israel for the development of health technologies with a focus on combating COVID-19.

S. 3873

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the names of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. COTTON) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. TILLIS) were added as cosponsors of S. 3873, a bill to require law enforcement agencies to report the use of lethal force, and for other purposes.

S. 3895

At the request of Mrs. GILLIBRAND, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PETERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3895, a bill to amend section 242 of title 18, United States Code, to include the use of chokeholds and carotid holds as a deprivation of rights and as a punishment, pain, or penalty, and for other purposes.

S. 3902

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3902, a bill to amend the Insurrection Act to curtail violations against the civil liberties of the people of the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 3909

At the request of Mr. MURPHY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3909, a bill to require Federal law enforcement officers, including contract employees, and members of the armed forces engaged in crowd control, riot control, or arrest or detainment of individuals engaged in civil disobedience, demonstrations, protests, or riots to visibly display identifying information.

S. RES. 592

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 592, a resolution expressing support for the designation of June 5, 2020, as "National Gun Violence Awareness Day" and June 2020 as "National Gun Violence Awareness Month".

AMENDMENT NO. 1597

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the names of the Senator from Texas (Mr. CRUZ), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. WHITEHOUSE) and the Senator from Mississippi (Mrs. HYDE-SMITH) were added as cosponsors of amendment No. 1597 intended to be proposed to H.R. 1957, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. THUNE (for himself and Ms. BALDWIN):

S. 3918. A bill to modify the calculation of the maximum loan amount for certain farmers and ranchers under the paycheck protection program of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship.

Mr. THUNE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3918

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Paycheck Protection for Producers Act”.

SEC. 2. CALCULATION OF MAXIMUM LOAN AMOUNT FOR FARMERS AND RANCHERS UNDER THE PAYCHECK PROTECTION PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(a)(36) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(a)(36)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “During” and inserting “Except as provided in subparagraph (T), during”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(T) CALCULATION OF MAXIMUM LOAN AMOUNT FOR FARMERS AND RANCHERS.—

“(i) DEFINITION.—In this subparagraph, the term ‘covered recipient’ means an eligible recipient that—

“(I) operates as a sole proprietorship or as an independent contractor, or is an eligible self-employed individual;

“(II) reports farm income or expenses on a Schedule F (or any equivalent successor schedule); and

“(III) was in business during the period beginning on February 15, 2019 and ending on June 30, 2019.

“(ii) NO EMPLOYEES.—With respect to covered recipient without employees, the maximum covered loan amount shall be the lesser of—

“(I) the sum of—

“(aa) the product obtained by multiplying—

“(AA) the gross income of the covered recipient in 2019, as reported on a Schedule F (or any equivalent successor schedule), that is not more than \$100,000, divided by 12; and

“(BB) 2.5; and

“(bb) the outstanding amount of a loan under subsection (b)(2) that was made during the period beginning on January 31, 2020 and ending on April 3, 2020 that the borrower intends to refinance under the covered loan, not including any amount of any advance under the loan that is not required to be repaid; or

“(II) \$10,000,000.

“(iii) WITH EMPLOYEES.—With respect to a covered recipient with employees, the maximum covered loan amount shall be calculated using the formula described in subparagraph (E), except that the gross income of the covered recipient described in clause (ii)(I)(aa)(AA) of this subparagraph, as divided by 12, shall be added to the sum calculated under subparagraph (E)(i)(I).

“(iv) RECALCULATION.—A lender that made a covered loan to a covered recipient before the date of enactment of this subparagraph may, at the request of the covered recipient—

“(I) recalculate the maximum loan amount applicable to that covered loan based on the formula described in clause (ii) or (iii), as applicable, if doing so would result in a larger covered loan amount; and

“(II) provide the covered recipient with additional covered loan amounts based on that recalculation.”.

By Mr. DURBIN:

S. 3924. A bill to provide tax credits to low- to moderate-income individuals for certain computer and education costs, to direct the Federal Communications Commission to modify the requirements for the Lifeline program to provide increased support, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3924

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Computer and Internet Access Equity Act”.

SEC. 2. INCREASED LIFELINE SUPPORT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission.

(2) TERMS DEFINED IN REGULATIONS.—The terms defined in section 54.400 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation), have the meanings given those terms in that section.

(b) REGULATIONS.—Not later than 14 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall promulgate regulations to modify the requirements for the Lifeline program set forth in subpart E of part 54 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act) to provide for the following:

(1) The amount of Lifeline support that a provider of Lifeline service may receive for providing such service to each qualifying low-income consumer shall be increased by the lesser of—

(A) \$83.33 per month; or

(B) the amount needed to make the amount of Lifeline support received by the provider equal to the cost of providing such service, except that such cost may not exceed the cost to the provider of providing an equivalent level of voice telephony service or broadband internet access service (as applicable) to a consumer who does not receive Lifeline service.

(2) The percentage of the Federal Poverty Guidelines (as specified in section 54.409(a) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations) at or below which a consumer’s household income must be in order for the consumer to constitute a qualifying low-income consumer on the basis of income shall be increased to 435 percent.

(3) A provider of broadband internet access service shall not be required to be designated as an eligible telecommunications carrier under section 214(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 214(e)) in order to receive Lifeline support for providing such service to a qualifying low-income consumer.

(c) DURATION.—The modifications made by the regulations promulgated under subsection (b) shall cease to have any force or effect on the date that is 12 years after the date on which the regulations are promulgated.

(d) CONSUMER PROTECTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A provider of broadband internet access service that receives Lifeline support for providing such service to a qualified low-income consumer—

(A) shall provide such service to the consumer at a minimum speed of 25 megabits per second for downloads and 3 megabits per second for uploads, which minimum speed shall be reevaluated and, if appropriate, increased by the Commission not less frequently than once every 3 years;

(B) shall provide a level of customer service to the consumer that is comparable to the customer service that the provider provides to consumers of broadband internet access service who do not receive Lifeline service;

(C) shall offer such service to each qualified low-income consumer in the designated service area of the provider; and

(D)(i) shall advertise the availability of such service and the charges therefor using media of general distribution throughout the designated service area of the provider to increase awareness among consumers (including non-English speaking consumers) that they may be eligible for such service; and

(ii) may partner with State agencies responsible for the provision of social assistance and service programs in conducting advertising under clause (i).

(2) DESIGNATED SERVICE AREA.—A State commission or the Commission, as applicable, shall establish a designated service area for a provider of broadband internet access service described in paragraph (1) for purposes of that paragraph in the same manner as the State commission or Commission establishes a designated service area for a common carrier under paragraph (5) or (6), as applicable, of section 214(e) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 214(e)).

SEC. 3. INTERNET EDUCATION AND TRAINING GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) COMMISSION.—The term “Commission” means the Federal Communications Commission.

(2) COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATION.—The term “community-based organization” has the meaning given the term in section 3 of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (29 U.S.C. 3102).

(3) DIGITAL LITERACY.—The term “digital literacy” means the skills associated with using technology.

(4) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term “eligible entity” means—

(A) a nonprofit organization;

(B) a not-for-profit social welfare organization; or

(C) a community-based organization.

(5) FEDERAL POVERTY GUIDELINES.—The term “Federal Poverty Guidelines” means the Federal Poverty Guidelines used for purposes of section 54.409(a)(1) of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

(6) HOUSEHOLD.—The term “household” has the meaning given the term in section 54.400 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

(7) INCOME.—The term “income” has the meaning given the term in section 54.400 of title 47, Code of Federal Regulations (or any successor regulation).

(8) NONPROFIT ORGANIZATION.—The term “nonprofit organization” means an organization described in section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code.

(9) NOT-FOR-PROFIT SOCIAL WELFARE ORGANIZATION.—The term “not-for-profit social welfare organization” means an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from tax under section 501(a) of such Code.

(b) **GRANTS AUTHORIZED.**—Not later than 100 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall establish a program to make grants on a competitive basis to eligible entities to develop and carry out an internet safety education or training program.

(c) **APPLICATIONS.**—An eligible entity that wishes to receive a grant under this section shall submit to the Commission an application at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Commission may require.

(d) **USE OF FUNDS.**—An eligible entity that receives a grant under this section shall use grant funds to—

(1) develop a program to provide internet education and training, which may address cyberbullying, online privacy, cybersecurity, and digital literacy, to individuals living in households with an income at or below 435 percent of the Federal Poverty Guidelines for households of the applicable size; and

(2) provide such education or training to such individuals through such program.

(e) **REPORTS.**—

(1) **REPORTS TO COMMISSION.**—Not later than 3 years after the date on which an entity receives a grant under this section, the entity shall publish and submit to the Commission a report that—

(A) describes the use of the grant by the entity, including the number of individuals served by the entity using grant funds;

(B) describes the progress of the entity toward fulfilling the objectives for which the grant was awarded; and

(C) includes any additional information required by the Commission.

(2) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commission shall publish and submit to Congress a report that—

(A) summarizes the data from the reports that the Commission has received under paragraph (1); and

(B) assesses the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the grant program established under this section.

(f) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this section.

SEC. 4. CREDIT FOR COMPUTER COSTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 36B the following new section:

“SEC. 36C. CREDIT FOR COMPUTER COSTS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the case of an eligible individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this subtitle for the taxable year an amount equal the lesser of—

“(1) the amount of qualified computer costs paid or incurred by the taxpayer during such taxable year,

“(2) \$2,000, or

“(3) an amount equal to \$10,000 (\$20,000 in the case of a joint return) minus the sum of any credits allowed to the taxpayer under this section for any preceding taxable year.

“(b) **QUALIFIED COMPUTER COSTS.**—For purposes of this section, the term ‘qualified computer costs’ means amounts paid or incurred for computers, printers, and other education-related technology.

“(c) **LIMITATION BASED ON ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.**—The amount of the credit allowed by subsection (a) (determined without regard to this subsection) shall be reduced by 5 percent of so much of the taxpayer’s adjusted gross income as exceeds—

“(1) \$150,000 in the case of a joint return,

“(2) \$112,500 in the case of a head of household, and

“(3) \$75,000 in the case of a taxpayer not described in paragraph (1) or (2).

“(d) **ELIGIBLE INDIVIDUAL.**—The term ‘eligible individual’ means any individual other than—

“(1) any nonresident alien individual,

“(2) any individual with respect to whom a deduction under section 151 is allowable to another taxpayer for a taxable year begin-

ning in the calendar year in which the individual’s taxable year begins, and

“(3) an estate or trust.

“(e) **APPLICATION OF SECTION.**—This section shall only apply to qualified computer costs incurred by the taxpayer after December 31, 2019, and before January 1, 2032.”.

(b) **ADVANCE PAYMENT OF CREDIT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 77 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after section 7527 the following new section:

“SEC. 7527A. ADVANCE PAYMENT OF CREDIT FOR COMPUTER COSTS.

“(a) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of the enactment of this section, the Secretary shall establish a program for making advance payments of the credit allowed under section 36C (determined without regard to subsection (e) of such section), on such basis as the Secretary determines to be administratively feasible, to taxpayers determined to be eligible for advance payment of such credit.

“(b) **LIMITATION.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may make payments under subsection (a) only to the extent that the total amount of such payments made to any taxpayer during the taxable year does not exceed the amount of the credit determined under subsection (a) of section 36C, as determined based on application of subsection (c) of such section using the adjusted gross income of the taxpayer for the most recent taxable year for which a return has been filed during any of the preceding 3 taxable years.

“(2) **NON-FILERS.**—In the case of any taxpayer who has not filed a return during the period described in paragraph (1), such paragraph shall be applied without regard to subsection (c) of section 36C.”.

(2) **RECONCILIATION OF CREDIT AND ADVANCE CREDIT.**—Section 36C of such Code, as added by subsection (a), is amended—

(A) by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (f), and

(B) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

“(e) **RECONCILIATION OF CREDIT AND ADVANCE CREDIT.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The amount of the credit allowed under this section for any taxable year shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the aggregate amount of any advance payments of such credit under section 7527A for such taxable year.

“(2) **EXCESS ADVANCE PAYMENTS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—If the aggregate amount of advance payments under section 7527A for the taxable year exceeds the amount of the credit allowed under this section for such taxable year (determined without regard to paragraph (1)), the tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year shall be increased by the amount of such excess.

“(B) **RETURN REQUIREMENT.**—If the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year is increased under this paragraph, the taxpayer shall, notwithstanding section 6012, be required to file a return with respect to the taxes imposed under this subtitle.”.

(c) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) Section 6211(b)(4)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “36C,” after “36B.”.

(2) Paragraph (2) of section 1324(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by inserting “36C,” after “36B.”.

(3) The table of sections for subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 36B the following new item:

“Sec. 36C. Credit for Computer Costs.”.

(4) The table of sections for chapter 77 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 7527 the following new item:

“Sec. 7527A. Advance payment of credit for computer costs.”.

(d) **PUBLIC AWARENESS CAMPAIGN.**—The Secretary of the Treasury (or the Secretary’s delegate) shall conduct a public awareness campaign, in coordination with the Commissioner of Social Security, the Secretary of

Veterans Affairs, and the heads of other relevant Federal and State agencies, to provide information to the public (including non-English speaking populations) regarding the availability of the credit allowed under section 36C of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and advance payment of such credit pursuant to section 7527A of such Code (as added by this section).

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to costs incurred in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2019.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 612—EX-PRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE TRAGIC DEATH OF GEORGE FLOYD WAS UNJUST AND THE PERPETRATORS MUST STAND TRIAL AND BE BROUGHT TO JUSTICE, THE FIRST AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION GUARANTEES INDIVIDUALS THE RIGHT TO PEACEABLY ASSEMBLE AND PROTEST, GROUPS LIKE ANTIFA AND THE INDIVIDUALS WHO TOOK OVER PEACEFUL PROTESTS WITH VIOLENCE, CHAOS, LOOTING, AND DESTRUCTION SHOULD BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR THEIR ACTIONS, THE ATTACKS ON LAW ENFORCEMENT, INDIVIDUALS, SMALL BUSINESSES, AND COMMUNITIES ARE CAUSING DEATH, INJURY AND MILLIONS OF DOLLARS IN DAMAGE, THE VAST MAJORITY OF MEN AND WOMEN IN LAW ENFORCEMENT WORK TIRELESSLY AND RISK THEIR LIVES TO PROTECT THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES WITHOUT PREJUDICE, POLICE DEPARTMENTS ARE THE CORNERSTONE FOR MAINTAINING A SOCIETY OF ORDER, CALLS TO DEFUND THE POLICE THREATEN THE SAFETY AND SECURITY OF THE PEOPLE OF THE UNITED STATES, CONGRESS WILL CONTINUE TO APPROPRIATE FUNDING TO LOCAL LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES THAT BOLSTER POLICE EFFORTS, AND THE NATION MUST COME TOGETHER IN HEALING, RECONCILIATION, AND PRAYER TO REAFFIRM THAT EVERY LIFE IS SACRED, OUR SOCIETY MUST STRIVE FOR EQUALITY, AND THAT WE WILL WORK TO ENSURE A TRAGEDY LIKE GEORGE FLOYD’S NEVER HAPPENS AGAIN IN THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. LOEFFLER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 612

Whereas, on Sunday, May 24, 2020, George Floyd of Minneapolis, Minnesota, was tragically killed by police officers who were subsequently and rightfully removed from their roles in serving the public, and were arrested and charged in connection with Floyd’s death;

Whereas the Senate finds that the rule of law in the United States is undermined when

law enforcement officers engage in conduct inconsistent with equal treatment, justice, and the Constitution of the United States;

Whereas since the death of George Floyd, peaceful protests by thousands of citizens exercising their First Amendment rights across the Nation have taken place;

Whereas unfortunately in a number of cities, many individuals have used this time of meaningful, peaceful protest and mourning to riot, loot businesses, and burn police cars and churches;

Whereas radical organizations like Antifa have sadly used the death of George Floyd to organize and sow violence in our communities and should be held accountable;

Whereas radical protesters defaced the Department of Veterans Affairs headquarters and the World War II Memorial, dishonoring the brave men and women who have served in the Armed Services;

Whereas radical protesters defaced the Lincoln Memorial, the place where the March on Washington began, that momentous occasion in the history of civil rights;

Whereas radical protesters burned St. John's Church, a church that supported the bold civil rights moment of the March on Washington;

Whereas these actions taken by radical protesters do not honor the legacy of George Floyd nor further a rational cause, and those acting as violent anarchists and the members of Antifa are taking advantage of the pain of people and the pain of the peaceful protesters;

Whereas protests are a normal and healthy part of democracy, while acts of violence, looting, and arson should not be tolerated;

Whereas in multiple cities, police and other law enforcement personnel have been intentionally attacked, injured, and killed, and many voices are radically calling to defend the police;

Whereas the vast majority of police officers do their job bravely and righteously and are committed to ensuring that racism plays no part in law enforcement and that everyone receives equal protection under the law; and

Whereas the United States has a moral and constitutional obligation to protect the life, liberty, and property of all individuals, including from abuse from those we entrust to defend public safety and from domestic terrorists and violent, anti-democratic activists: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that it is the policy of the United States—

(1) to commemorate the life of George Floyd through official recognition and remembrance;

(2) that the First Amendment guarantees every individual citizen the right to peacefully assemble and protest;

(3) to urge an immediate end to the violence leading to the damage of lives and businesses across United States so that the Nation can come together in healing, dialogue, reconciliation, and prayer;

(4) to urge leaders at every level of government to examine and enhance the training of law enforcement to ensure equal treatment and protection under the law; and

(5) to urge States and local governments to provide the funding and support necessary for law enforcement and first responders to protect the life, liberty, and property of every individual in the United States regardless of their race, color, or nationality.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED AND PROPOSED

SA 1599. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal

Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1600. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1601. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1602. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1603. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1604. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1605. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1606. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1607. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1608. Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1609. Mrs. BLACKBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1610. Mrs. BLACKBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1611. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1612. Mrs. HYDE-SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1613. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1614. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1615. Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1616. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1617. Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms.

SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1618. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1619. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1620. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1621. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

SA 1622. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, supra; which was ordered to lie on the table.

TEXT OF AMENDMENTS

SA 1599. Mr. KENNEDY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . ELIMINATION OF LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF DISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.

Section 105 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432) is amended by striking subsection (f).

SA 1600. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ . ENHANCED MULTIPLE USE MANAGEMENT OF PUBLIC LAND AND NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.

(a) **POLICY.**—In accordance with Federal multiple use land management goals, it is the policy of the United States that—

(1) the Secretary—

(A) shall not, absent exceptional circumstances, offer for lease any Federal land that has low or no potential for the development of oil and gas resources;

(B) shall discourage speculation in the Federal onshore oil and gas leasing program;

(C) by not offering for lease Federal land described in subparagraph (A), shall conserve limited Federal resources that can be better applied elsewhere; and

(2) the policies described in paragraph (1) are in keeping with, and are not detrimental to, the energy security of the United States.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) DRAINAGE.—The term “drainage” means the migration of hydrocarbons, inert gases (other than helium), or associated resources from a well caused by production from another well.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—The term “Federal land” means—

(A) public land; and

(B) National Forest System land.

(3) LAND USE PLAN.—The term “land use plan” means—

(A) a land use plan required under sections 201 and 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1711, 1712), including any resource management plan (as defined in section 1601.0-5 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations)); and

(B) a land and resource management plan developed by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604).

(4) PUBLIC LAND.—The term “public land” has the meaning given the term “public lands” in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702).

(5) REASONABLY FORESEEABLE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO.—The term “reasonably foreseeable development scenario” has the meaning given the term in the handbook of the Bureau of Land Management entitled “H—1624—1—Planning for Fluid Mineral Resources” (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act) and issued pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.).

(6) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Land Management.

(c) FEDERAL LAND COVERED BY REASONABLY FORESEEABLE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO ISSUED BEFORE DATE OF ENACTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—With respect to Federal land otherwise available for leasing of oil and gas resources pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) that is covered by a reasonably foreseeable development scenario issued before the date of enactment of this Act, except as provided in paragraph (2), the Secretary shall not offer the Federal land for lease unless the reasonably foreseeable development scenario for that land includes an assessment of the oil and gas development potential of that land that specifically identifies the potential for all acres subject to decisions on availability for leasing.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR DRAINAGE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may offer for lease any Federal land described in paragraph (1) without meeting the requirements of that paragraph if—

(i)(I) the Federal land is adjacent to land currently producing oil or gas; and

(II) the lease is issued for the purpose of preventing drainage from the adjacent land; or

(ii) the Federal land—

(I) does not exceed 640 acres; and

(II) is located within 1 mile of a well producing oil or gas in paying quantities on the date on which the Federal land is offered for leasing.

(B) REQUIREMENT.—A lease issued under subparagraph (A) shall be consistent with the applicable land use plan and all other applicable law.

(d) FEDERAL LAND NOT COVERED BY CURRENT REASONABLY FORESEEABLE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), if the Secretary determines

that Federal land otherwise available for leasing of oil and gas resources pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) is not covered by a reasonably foreseeable development scenario issued in accordance with this paragraph or subsection (c)(1), the Secretary, in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to National Forest System land, shall complete such a reasonably foreseeable development scenario.

(B) REQUIREMENTS.—Any reasonably foreseeable development scenario issued on or after the date of enactment of this Act shall, at a minimum—

(i) assess and designate all Federal land covered by the reasonably foreseeable development scenario as having high, moderate, low, or no potential for development of oil and gas resources; and

(ii) publish a map depicting the covered Federal land and the development potential for that Federal land designated under clause (i).

(C) FACTORS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In completing a reasonably foreseeable development scenario for Federal land, the Secretary shall take into consideration—

(I) past and present exploration and development activity in the vicinity, including historic trends;

(II) for each lease in the vicinity, the number, location, and types of wells drilled, the representative depth of wells drilled, the number and location of dry holes, the success ratio for wells drilled, and the location, production history, and life expectancy of producing fields;

(III) geological, geophysical, and geochemical information for the Federal land, including data and information from the United States Geological Survey, the Department of Energy, State agencies, industry, professional societies, academic sources, and the public;

(IV) structural and stratigraphic data and information relating to basins, fields, and plays on the Federal land; and

(V) data and information on the likelihood that economically recoverable oil and gas resources are present in a given area, including information submitted by experts and the public.

(ii) EXPLANATION OF FACTORS.—The Secretary shall document how each factor described in clause (i) and any other factors considered by the Secretary support the designation of the potential for development of oil and gas resources on the Federal land.

(D) OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—In carrying out a reasonably foreseeable development scenario under this paragraph, the Secretary shall—

(i) notify the public that the reasonably foreseeable development scenario is being initiated;

(ii) publish a request for information for the reasonably foreseeable development scenario;

(iii) release a draft version of the reasonably foreseeable development scenario for a public review and comment for a period of not less than 60 days; and

(iv) consider and respond to public comments in the final version of the reasonably foreseeable development scenario.

(2) REGULAR UPDATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 15 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and not less frequently than every 15 years thereafter, the Secretary, consistent with paragraph (1) and in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture with respect to National Forest System land, shall review and update all reasonably foreseeable development scenarios covering Federal land.

(B) PROHIBITION.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), the Secretary shall not offer for lease any Federal land otherwise available for leasing of oil and gas resources pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) unless the Secretary has updated the reasonably foreseeable development scenario covering that Federal land in accordance with subparagraph (A).

(3) EXCEPTION FOR DRAINAGE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may offer for lease any Federal land otherwise available for leasing of oil and gas resources pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) without completing or updating a reasonably foreseeable development scenario for that land under paragraph (1) or (2), as applicable, if—

(i)(I) the Federal land is adjacent to land currently producing oil or gas; and

(II) the lease is issued for the purpose of preventing drainage from the adjacent land; or

(ii) the Federal land—

(I) does not exceed 640 acres; and

(II) is located within 1 mile of a well producing oil or gas in paying quantities on the date on which the Federal land is offered for leasing.

(B) REQUIREMENT.—A lease issued under subparagraph (A) shall be consistent with the applicable land use plan and all other applicable law.

(e) LAND HAVING NO OR LOW DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL UNDER A REASONABLY FORESEEABLE DEVELOPMENT SCENARIO.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraphs (1) and (2), the Secretary shall not offer for lease any Federal land otherwise available for leasing of oil and gas resources pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351 et seq.) if the Federal land is designated in the applicable reasonably foreseeable development scenario as having low or no potential for development of oil or gas resources.

(2) EXCEPTION FOR DRAINAGE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may offer for lease any Federal land described in paragraph (1) if—

(i)(I) the Federal land is adjacent to land currently producing oil or gas; and

(II) the lease is issued for the purpose of preventing drainage from the adjacent land; or

(ii) the Federal land—

(I) does not exceed 640 acres; and

(II) is located within 1 mile of a well producing oil or gas in paying quantities on the date on which the Federal land is offered for leasing.

(B) REQUIREMENT.—A lease issued under subparagraph (A) shall be consistent with the applicable land use plan and all other applicable law.

(3) VARIANCE PROCESS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—An entity seeking to lease Federal land described in paragraph (1) for purposes other than the purpose described in paragraph (2)(A)(i)(II) may submit to the Secretary an application for a variance under which the applicant shall bear the full burden of establishing and documenting that providing a variance for the Federal land would—

(i) be consistent with decisions contained in the land use plan in effect for the Federal land;

(ii) affect only areas—

(I) with low wildlife, recreation, livestock, and other multiple-use resource values; and

(II) where impacts to those values arising from the variance can be resolved;

(iii) optimize the use of existing infrastructure and avoid duplication of infrastructure and disruption of public land;

(iv) minimize adverse impacts on fish and wildlife habitats and migration and movement corridors in nearby areas;

(v) cause no significant effects on species listed as endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) or the habitats of those species;

(vi) cause no cumulative impacts on air or water resources of concern that cannot be avoided or minimized;

(vii) cause no adverse impacts on—

(I) units of the National Park System;

(II) units of the National Wildlife Refuge System;

(III) areas of critical environmental concern;

(IV) components of the National Wilderness Preservation System; or

(V) other special status areas, including State and local parks and wildlife and recreation areas; and

(viii) allow the Federal land to be developed in the public interest.

(B) OPPORTUNITY FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—On receipt of an application for a variance under subparagraph (A), the Secretary shall—

(I) promptly notify the public that the application has been received; and

(II) provide the public with an opportunity to review and comment on the application, including any supporting documents, for a period of not less than 60 days.

(ii) RESPONSE.—The Secretary shall consider and respond in writing to any public comments received under clause (i)(II) before making a determination under subparagraph (C)(i).

(C) GRANTING OF VARIANCE.—The Secretary may grant a variance for Federal land described in paragraph (1) pursuant to an application submitted under subparagraph (A), and offer that Federal land for lease, if—

(i) the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register a determination that—

(I) the applicant met the burden of establishing and documenting that the variance would meet the requirements described in subparagraph (A);

(II) offering the Federal land for lease—

(aa) would not preclude the use of the Federal land for other uses, including grazing, fish and wildlife, and recreation uses; and

(bb) would be managed in accordance with the principles of multiple use (as defined in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702)); and

(III) the variance is in the public interest; and

(ii) the Federal land—

(I) is adjacent to land currently producing oil or gas in commercial quantities on the date on which the variance is granted; and

(II) does not exceed 640 acres.

(D) REQUIREMENT.—A lease issued under subparagraph (C) shall be consistent with the applicable land use plan and all other applicable law.

(E) LIMITATION.—The Secretary shall not grant more than 1 variance under this paragraph per 5-year period to an applicant or to an entity under common ownership or control with the applicant.

(f) EFFECT.—

(1) MULTIPLE USE CONSIDERATIONS.—Nothing in this section, including a determination under a reasonably foreseeable development scenario issued pursuant to this section that Federal land has high or moderate potential for development of oil and gas resources, alters—

(A) the requirements under section 202(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management

Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712(c)) that prior to offering for lease any public land otherwise available for leasing of oil and gas resources pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351 et seq.), the Secretary shall consider and weigh the multiple use and sustained yield values of the public land;

(B) the requirements of subsections (b) and (e) of section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604) that prior to offering for lease any National Forest System land otherwise available for leasing of oil and gas resources pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or the Mineral Leasing Act for Acquired Lands (30 U.S.C. 351 et seq.), the Secretary of Agriculture shall consider and weigh the multiple use and sustained yield values of the National Forest System land; or

(C) any other applicable requirements of law.

(2) NEPA.—Nothing in this section modifies, alters, or impacts the applicability of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) to the leasing of Federal land by the Secretary.

SA 1601. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ . WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LAND.

(a) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this section, the term “Map” means the Forest Service map entitled “S. 258 Ruby Mountains Protective Act” and dated December 5, 2019.

(b) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 309,272 acres of Federal land and interests in the land located in the Ruby Mountains subdistrict of the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest within the area depicted on the Map as “National Forest System Lands” are withdrawn from all forms of operation under the mineral leasing laws.

(c) APPLICATION.—Any land or interest in land within the boundary of the Ruby Mountains subdistrict of the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest that is acquired by the United States after the date of enactment of this Act shall be withdrawn in accordance with subsection (b).

(d) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The Map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

SA 1602. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ . TRANSFER AND WITHDRAWAL OF BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND FOR USE AS A NATIONAL CEMETERY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) FEDERAL LAND.—The term “Federal land” means the approximately 15 acres of Bureau of Land Management land in Elko, Nevada, that is more particularly described as NE¼ SW¼NW¼, N½SE¼SW¼NW¼, sec. 8,

T. 34 N., R. 55 E., of the Mount Diablo Meridian, as depicted on the map prepared by the Bureau of Land Management, entitled “Proposed National Cemetery-Elko Nevada”, and dated September 9, 2015.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, administrative jurisdiction over the Federal land is transferred from the Secretary to the Secretary of Veterans Affairs for use as a national cemetery in accordance with chapter 24 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall publish in the Federal Register a notice containing a legal description of the Federal land.

(B) EFFECT.—A legal description published under subparagraph (A) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this section, except that the Secretary may correct any clerical and typographical errors in the legal description.

(C) AVAILABILITY.—Copies of the legal description published under subparagraph (A) shall be available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of—

(i) the Bureau of Land Management; and

(ii) the National Cemetery Administration.

(D) COSTS.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall reimburse the Secretary for the costs incurred by the Secretary in carrying out this paragraph, including the costs of any surveys and other reasonable costs.

(c) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, for any period during which the Federal land is under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, the Federal land—

(1) is withdrawn from all forms of appropriation under the public land laws, including the mining laws, the mineral leasing laws, and the geothermal leasing laws; and

(2) shall be treated as property (as defined in section 102 of title 40, United States Code).

SA 1603. Ms. CORTEZ MASTO submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ . INTERAGENCY TASK FORCE ON OUTDOOR RECREATION FOR VETERANS.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall establish a task force to be known as the “Task Force on Outdoor Recreation for Veterans” (in this section referred to as the “Task Force”).

(b) COMPOSITION.—The Task Force shall be composed of the following members or their designees:

(1) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs.

(2) The Secretary of the Interior.

(3) The Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(4) The Secretary of Agriculture.

(5) The Secretary of Defense.

(6) The Secretary of Homeland Security.

(7) The Chief of the Army Corps of Engineers.

(8) Any other member that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs determines to be appropriate.

(c) CHAIRPERSONS.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs and the Secretary of the Interior shall serve as co-chairpersons of the

Task Force (in this section referred to as the “Chairpersons”).

(d) DUTIES.—

(1) TASK FORCE.—The duties of the Task Force shall be—

(A) to identify opportunities to formalize coordination between the Department of Veterans Affairs, public land agencies, and partner organizations regarding the use of public lands or other outdoor spaces for medical treatment and recreational therapy for veterans;

(B) to identify barriers that exist to providing veterans with opportunities for medical treatment and therapy through the use of outdoor recreation on public lands or other outdoor spaces; and

(C) to develop recommendations to better facilitate the use of public lands or other outdoor spaces for preventative care, medical treatment, and therapy for veterans.

(2) CONSULTATION.—The Task Force shall carry out the duties under paragraph (1) in consultation with appropriate veterans outdoor recreation groups.

(e) REPORTS.—

(1) PRELIMINARY REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the Task Force is established, the Chairpersons shall submit to Congress a report on the preliminary findings of the Task Force.

(2) FINAL REPORT.—Not later than one year after the date of the submittal of the preliminary report under paragraph (1), the Chairpersons shall submit to Congress a report on the findings of the Task Force, which shall include the recommendations developed under subsection (d)(1)(C).

(f) DURATION.—The Task Force shall terminate on the date that is one year after the date of the submittal of the final report under in subsection (e)(2).

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) The term “public lands” means any recreational lands under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government or a State or local government.

(2) The term “veteran” has the meaning given that term in section 101 of title 38, United States Code.

SA 1604. Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. MERKLEY, and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. REAUTHORIZATION OF PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES PROGRAM.

Section 6906 of title 31, United States Code, is amended in the matter preceding paragraph (1) by striking “fiscal year 2019” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2019 through 2029”.

SEC. 5. FEDERAL CHARTER FOR FOREST AND REFUGE COUNTY FOUNDATION AND ESTABLISHMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES PERMANENT FUND.

(a) FEDERAL CHARTER FOR FOREST AND REFUGE COUNTY FOUNDATION.—Subtitle III of title 36, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 3001 the following:

“CHAPTER 3002—FOREST AND REFUGE COUNTY FOUNDATION

“Sec.

“300201. Definitions.

“300202. Establishment.

“300203. Status and applicable laws.

“300204. Board of Directors.

“300205. Bylaws and duties.

“300206. Authority of Corporation.

“300207. Establishment of Natural Resources Permanent Fund.

“§ 300201. Definitions

“In this chapter:

“(1) AGENCY HEAD.—The term ‘agency head’ means—

“(A) the Secretary of the Treasury;

“(B) the Chief of the Forest Service;

“(C) the Director of the Bureau of Land Management; and

“(D) the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

“(2) BOARD.—The term ‘Board’ means the Board of Directors of the Corporation.

“(3) CHAIRPERSON.—The term ‘Chairperson’ means the Chairperson of the Board.

“(4) CORPORATION.—The term ‘Corporation’ means the Forest and Refuge County Foundation established by section 300202.

“(5) COUNTY PAYMENT; FULL FUNDING AMOUNT; STATE PAYMENT.—The terms ‘county payment’, ‘full funding amount’, and ‘State payment’ have the meanings given those terms in section 3 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7102).

“(6) ELIGIBLE COUNTY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘eligible county’ means—

“(i) a county that is eligible for a payment under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), with respect to an account established by paragraph (1) or (2) of section 300207(b); or

“(ii) a county that is eligible for a payment under section 401(c) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the ‘Refuge Revenue Sharing Act’) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c)), with respect to the account established by section 300207(b)(3).

“(B) EXCLUSION.—The term ‘eligible county’ does not include a county that has elected to opt out of distributions from the Fund under section 300207(e)(4)(A).

“(7) FUND.—The term ‘Fund’ means the Natural Resources Permanent Fund established by section 300207(a).

“(8) HIGHEST HISTORIC PAYMENT.—The term ‘highest historic payment’ means—

“(A) with respect to the Forest Service Account of the Fund, an amount equal to the total amount of State payments received under section 101(a) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111(a)) for fiscal year 2008 (as adjusted to reflect changes during the period beginning on October 1, 2008, in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor); and

“(B) with respect to the Bureau of Land Management Account of the Fund, an amount equal to the total amount of county payments received under section 101(b) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111(b)) for fiscal year 2006 (as adjusted to reflect changes during the period beginning on October 1, 2006, in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor).

“(9) MANAGER.—The term ‘manager’ means the manager of investments employed by the Board pursuant to section 300205(c)(3).

“(10) RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The term ‘resource advisory committee’ means—

“(A) a resource advisory committee established under section 205 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7125) (as in effect on September 29, 2023); and

“(B) an advisory council established pursuant to section 309(a) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1739(a)).

“(11) SECRETARY CONCERNED.—The term ‘Secretary concerned’ means—

“(A) the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to the account established by section 300207(b)(1); and

“(B) the Secretary of the Interior, with respect to an account established by paragraph (2) or (3) of section 300207(b).

“§ 300202. Establishment

“There is established a federally chartered, nonprofit corporation, to be known as the ‘Forest and Refuge County Foundation’, which shall be incorporated in the State of Oregon.

“§ 300203. Status and applicable laws

“(a) NON-FEDERAL ENTITY.—The Corporation is not—

“(1) a department, agency, or instrumentality of the United States Government; or

“(2) subject to title 31.

“(b) LIABILITY.—The United States Government shall not be liable for the actions or inactions of the Corporation.

“(c) NONPROFIT CORPORATION.—The Corporation shall have and maintain the status of the Corporation as a nonprofit corporation exempt from taxation under the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

“§ 300204. Board of Directors

“(a) AUTHORITY.—The powers of the Corporation shall be vested in a Board of Directors that governs the Corporation.

“(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

“(1) COMPOSITION.—The Board shall be composed of 11 members, of whom—

“(A) 3 shall be appointed by the Chief of the Forest Service;

“(B) 2 shall be appointed by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management; and

“(C) 6 shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

“(2) QUALIFICATIONS.—In making appointments under paragraph (1), the agency heads shall—

“(A) appoint members who represent the various regions of the United States; and

“(B) ensure that the membership of the Board is—

“(i) apolitical; and

“(ii) fairly balanced in terms of—

“(I) the points of view represented; and

“(II) the functions to be performed by the Board, by appointing—

“(aa) 3 members who are county elected officials, as of the date of appointment of the members, of whom—

“(AA) 1 shall be an elected official of a county that contains Federal land described in section 3(7)(A) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7102(7)(A));

“(BB) 1 shall be an elected official of a county that contains Federal land described in section 3(7)(B) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7102(7)(B)); and

“(CC) 1 shall be an elected official of a county that is eligible for a payment under section 401(c) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the ‘Refuge Revenue Sharing Act’) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c));

“(bb) 1 member to represent rural economic development interests;

“(cc) 6 members with expert experience in fund management or finance; and

“(dd) 1 member to represent education interests.

“(3) PROHIBITION.—A member of the Board, other than a member described in paragraph (2)(B)(ii)(II)(aa), shall not hold an office, position, or employment in any political party.

“(4) DATE.—The appointments of the members of the Board shall be made not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this chapter.

“(c) CHAIRPERSON.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Chairperson of the Board shall be selected from among the

members of the Board by a majority vote of the members.

“(2) TERM OF SERVICE.—The Chairperson of the Board—

“(A) shall serve for a term of not longer than 4 years; and

“(B) may be reelected to serve an additional term, subject to the condition that the Chairperson may serve for not more than 2 consecutive terms.

“(d) TERMS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term of the members of the Board shall be 6 years, except that the agency heads shall designate staggered terms for the members initially appointed to the Board.

“(2) REAPPOINTMENT.—A member of the Board may be reappointed to serve an additional term, subject to the condition that the member may serve for not more than 2 consecutive terms.

“(e) VACANCY.—A vacancy on the Board shall be filled—

“(1) by not later than 90 days after the date on which the vacancy occurs; and

“(2) in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

“(f) TRANSITIONS.—Any member of the Board may continue to serve after the expiration of the term for which the member was appointed or elected until a qualified successor has been appointed or elected.

“(g) MEETINGS AND QUORUM.—

“(1) MEETINGS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall meet—

“(i) not less frequently than once each calendar year; and

“(ii) (I) at the call of—

“(aa) the Chairperson; or

“(bb) 3 or more members; or

“(II) as otherwise provided in the bylaws of the Corporation.

“(B) INITIAL MEETING.—Not later than 150 days after the date of enactment of this chapter, the Board shall hold an initial meeting of the Board.

“(2) QUORUM.—A quorum of the Board, consisting of a majority of the members of the Board, shall be required to conduct any business of the Board.

“(3) APPROVAL OF BOARD ACTIONS.—Except as otherwise provided, the threshold for approving Board actions shall be as set forth in the bylaws of the Corporation.

“(h) REIMBURSEMENT OF EXPENSES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A voting member of the Board—

“(A) shall serve without pay; but

“(B) subject to paragraph (2), may be reimbursed for the actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses incurred by the member in the performance of duties for the Corporation.

“(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount of reimbursement under paragraph (1)(B) may not exceed the amount that would be authorized under section 5703 of title 5 for the payment of expenses and allowances for an individual employed intermittently in the Federal Government service.

“§ 300205. Bylaws and duties

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Board shall adopt, and may amend, the bylaws of the Corporation.

“(b) BYLAWS.—The bylaws of the Corporation shall include, at a minimum—

“(1) the duties and responsibilities of the Board; and

“(2) the operational procedures of the Corporation.

“(c) DUTIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF BOARD.—The Board shall be responsible for actions of the Corporation, including—

“(1)(A) employing individuals at the Corporation to provide investment management services; or

“(B) retaining the services of investment management services providers;

“(2) employing individuals at the Corporation to provide accounting and administrative services;

“(3) employing a manager of investments to manage the amounts authorized to be invested by the Board in accordance with subsection (d);

“(4) entering into a contract with 1 or more banking or trust entities to act as the custodian of the assets of the Fund; and

“(5) engaging other appropriate professional service providers to support the Board and the employees of the Board in carrying out the duties and responsibilities of the Board under this chapter.

“(d) AUTHORITY OF MANAGER.—Subject to the direction of the Board, the manager shall have control over the amounts under the jurisdiction of the Board in the same manner as if the manager owned those amounts.

“§ 300206. Authority of Corporation

“Except as otherwise provided in this chapter, the Corporation, acting through the manager, shall have the authority—

“(1) to manage the Fund;

“(2) to make investments of amounts in the Fund under section 300207(d);

“(3) to make distributions from the Fund under section 300207(e)(2); and

“(4) to review certifications submitted by participating counties under section 303(a) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7143(a)).

“§ 300207. Establishment of Natural Resources Permanent Fund

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Corporation a permanent fund, to be known as the ‘Natural Resources Permanent Fund’, consisting of—

“(1) amounts deposited in the accounts under subsection (b);

“(2) amounts deposited by an eligible county or State under subsection (c)(1);

“(3) amounts credited to the Fund under subsection (d)(3); and

“(4) amounts appropriated to the Fund under paragraph (1) of subsection (i), subject to paragraph (2) of that subsection.

“(b) ACCOUNTS.—Within the Fund, there are established the following accounts:

“(1) The Forest Service Account, consisting of the amounts transferred under section 5(c)(2)(B) of the Great American Outdoors Act.

“(2) The Bureau of Land Management Account, consisting of the amounts transferred under paragraphs (3)(B) and (4)(B) of section 5(c) of the Great American Outdoors Act.

“(3) The United States Fish and Wildlife Service Account, consisting of the amounts transferred under section 5(c)(5)(B) of the Great American Outdoors Act.

“(4) The Voluntary County Savings Account, consisting of voluntary contributions of additional funds transferred under subsection (c)(2)(A)(i).

“(c) VOLUNTARY CONTRIBUTIONS OF ADDITIONAL FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2), the Corporation may at any time accept from eligible counties and States voluntary contributions of amounts to be deposited in the Fund, for investment by the Corporation, in accordance with this chapter.

“(2) LIMITATION.—Any amounts contributed under paragraph (1)—

“(A) shall be—

“(i) transferred to the Voluntary County Savings Account; and

“(ii) maintained within a segregated account in that Account for each contributing county; and

“(B) may only be distributed to the eligible county or State that deposited the amounts, in accordance with this chapter and paragraph (3).

“(3) DISTRIBUTIONS.—Distributions to an eligible county or a State under paragraph (2)(B)—

“(A) shall be made by not later than 30 days after the date of receipt of a written request of the applicable eligible county or State;

“(B) shall not be subject to any restrictions or limitations associated with distributions made from an account established by paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (b); and

“(C) may only be used for a governmental purpose that complies with the budget laws of the applicable State.

“(d) INVESTMENTS OF FUND.—

“(1) INVESTMENT POLICY.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this chapter, the Board shall develop an investment policy for the investment of amounts in the Fund.

“(B) REQUIREMENT.—For purposes of the investment policy developed under subparagraph (A), the Corporation shall—

“(i) seek to achieve at least a 5-percent rate of return on investments of the Fund, net of inflation; and

“(ii) adopt asset management strategies that are consistent with the standard of care established under the Uniform Prudent Management of Institutional Funds Act of 2007 (D.C. Code 44-1631 et seq.).

“(C) PERIODIC UPDATES.—The Corporation shall—

“(i) not less frequently than annually, review the investment policy developed under subparagraph (A); and

“(ii) based on a review conducted under clause (i), modify the investment policy as the Corporation determines to be appropriate.

“(2) INVESTMENT SERVICES.—For purposes of investing amounts in the Fund, the Corporation may—

“(A) employ individuals at the Corporation to provide investment management services; or

“(B) retain the services of investment management services providers.

“(3) INCOME.—Income from any investments of amounts from an account within the Fund shall be credited to the applicable account within the Fund.

“(e) EXPENDITURES FROM FUND.—

“(1) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—For each fiscal year, the Corporation shall make available for distribution in accordance with this subsection 4.5 percent of amounts in each account within the Fund established by paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (b), as determined by the Corporation, based on—

“(A) for the initial 3 fiscal years during which the Fund is in operation, the average fiscal year-end balance of the applicable account; and

“(B) thereafter, the average fiscal year-end balance of the applicable account during the 3-year period preceding the date of the determination.

“(2) DISTRIBUTIONS.—

“(A) FOREST SERVICE ACCOUNT AND BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT ACCOUNT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, of the amounts in each of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management Accounts within the Fund available for distribution for the fiscal year, as determined under paragraph (1)—

“(I) 85 percent shall be used to make payments to eligible States and eligible counties in accordance with title I of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111 et seq.) and clause (ii); and

“(II) 15 percent shall be used to make payments to eligible States and eligible counties in accordance with title III of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7141 et seq.).

“(ii) CALCULATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF AUTHORIZED PAYMENTS.—

“(I) AVAILABILITY.—Not later than 14 days after the beginning of each fiscal year, the Corporation shall submit to the Secretary concerned a description of the amount available in each of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management Accounts within the Fund available to make payments for the fiscal year, as determined under paragraph (1), to—

“(aa) eligible States under subsection (a) of section 101 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111), with respect to the Forest Service Account; and

“(bb) eligible counties under subsection (b) of that section, with respect to the Bureau of Land Management Account.

“(II) CALCULATION.—Not later than 14 days after the date on which the Corporation submits the information under subclause (I), based on the information provided under that subclause and the amounts otherwise available to the Secretary concerned for the fiscal year to make payments to eligible counties under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.), as determined by the Secretary concerned, the Secretary concerned shall, based on the formulas for authorized payments established under that Act, calculate and submit to the Corporation the authorized payment amount for each eligible county, including—

“(aa) the amount of the authorized payment for each eligible county to be paid from the applicable account in the Fund; and

“(bb) the amount of the authorized payment to be paid for each eligible county using amounts made available under section 402 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7152).

“(III) DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to subparagraphs (C) and (D), not later than 40 days after the date on which the Secretary concerned submits the information to the Corporation under subclause (II)—

“(aa) the Corporation shall—

“(AA) distribute from the Forest Service Account within the Fund to States, for redistribution to the eligible counties, the amount of the authorized payment to be paid to eligible counties within the State under section 101(a) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111(a)), as determined under subclause (II)(aa), to be used for the purposes authorized under title I or III of that Act (16 U.S.C. 7111 et seq.);

“(BB) distribute from the Bureau of Land Management Account within the Fund to the eligible counties the amount of the authorized payment to be paid to eligible counties under section 101(b) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111(b)), as determined under subclause (II)(aa), to be used for the purposes authorized under title I or III of that Act (16 U.S.C. 7111 et seq.); and

“(CC) submit to the Secretary concerned a description of the amounts distributed under subitems (AA) and (BB); and

“(bb) except as provided in subparagraph (C)(ii)(II), the Secretary concerned shall pay to eligible counties, and to the State for redistribution to eligible counties, the amount of the authorized payments under subclause (II)(bb).

“(B) UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE ACCOUNT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, amounts in the United States Fish and Wildlife Service Account within the Fund available for distribution for the fiscal year, as determined under paragraph (1), shall be used to make payments to eligible counties,

in accordance with section 401(c) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the ‘Refuge Revenue Sharing Act’) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c)) and clause (ii).

“(ii) CALCULATION AND DISTRIBUTION OF AUTHORIZED PAYMENTS.—

“(I) AVAILABILITY.—Not later than 14 days after the beginning of each fiscal year, the Corporation shall submit to the Secretary concerned a description of the amount available in United States Fish and Wildlife Service Account within the Fund available to make authorized payments to eligible counties for the fiscal year under section 401(c) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the ‘Refuge Revenue Sharing Act’) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c)), as determined under paragraph (1).

“(II) CALCULATION.—Not later than 14 days after the date on which the Corporation submits the information under subclause (I), based on the information provided under that subclause and the amounts otherwise available to the Secretary concerned for the fiscal year to make payments to eligible counties under section 401(c) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the ‘Refuge Revenue Sharing Act’) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c)), as determined by the Secretary concerned, the Secretary concerned shall, based on the formulas for authorized payments established under that Act, calculate and submit to the Corporation the authorized payment amount for each eligible county, including—

“(aa) the amount of the authorized payment for each eligible county to be paid from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service Account within the Fund; and

“(bb) the amount of the authorized payment to be paid for each eligible county using amounts made available under section 401(c) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the ‘Refuge Revenue Sharing Act’) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c)).

“(III) DISTRIBUTION.—Subject to subparagraphs (C) and (D), not later than 40 days after the date on which the Secretary concerned submits the information to the Corporation under subclause (II)—

“(aa) the Corporation shall—

“(AA) distribute from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service Account within the Fund to the eligible counties the amount of the authorized payment to be paid from that Account to eligible counties, as determined under subclause (II)(aa), to be used for the purposes authorized under section 401(c)(5)(C) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the ‘Refuge Revenue Sharing Act’) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c)(5)(C)); and

“(BB) submit to the Secretary concerned a description of the amounts distributed under subitem (AA); and

“(bb) except as provided in subparagraph (C)(ii)(II), the Secretary concerned shall pay to the eligible counties the amount to be paid for eligible counties under subclause (II)(bb).

“(C) MINIMUM PAYMENT AMOUNT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), the minimum amount of a payment to be distributed to a State or eligible county under subitem (AA) or (BB) of subparagraph (A)(ii)(III)(aa) or subparagraph (B)(ii)(III)(aa)(AA) for a fiscal year shall be the amount of the payment authorized to be made to the State or eligible county for fiscal year 2017 under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.) or section 401(c) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the ‘Refuge Revenue Sharing Act’) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c)), as applicable (as adjusted to reflect changes during the period beginning on October 1, 2017, in the Consumer Price

Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor).

“(ii) OBLIGATION OF SECRETARY.—The Secretary concerned—

“(I) shall only make a payment to a State or eligible county under subparagraph (A)(ii)(III)(bb) or (B)(ii)(III)(bb) for a fiscal year if the Secretary concerned determines that the amount of the payment to be distributed from the Fund to the State or eligible county under subitem (AA) or (BB) of subparagraph (A)(ii)(III)(aa) or subparagraph (B)(ii)(III)(aa)(AA) is less than the minimum payment amount required under clause (i); and

“(II) if the Secretary concerned determines that the amount of a payment to be distributed to a State or eligible county under subitem (AA) or (BB) of subparagraph (A)(ii)(III)(aa) or subparagraph (B)(ii)(III)(aa)(AA) would exceed the minimum payment amount required under clause (i), shall not make the payment otherwise required under subparagraph (A)(ii)(III)(bb) or (B)(ii)(III)(bb), as applicable, for the fiscal year.

“(D) MAXIMUM PAYMENT AMOUNT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), in any case in which the total amount of payments to be distributed by the Corporation to States or eligible counties, as applicable, from an account within the Fund for a fiscal year, as calculated under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II)(aa) or (B)(ii)(II)(aa), as applicable, would exceed the applicable highest historic payment, the Corporation shall reduce the total amount to be distributed under subitem (AA) or (BB) of subparagraph (A)(ii)(III)(aa) or subparagraph (B)(ii)(III)(aa)(AA), as applicable, to the amount of the applicable highest historic payment.

“(ii) EFFECT OF MEETING MAXIMUM.—For any fiscal year for which amounts in the Fund are sufficient to ensure that each State and eligible county receives from an account within the Fund for a fiscal year, as calculated under subparagraph (A)(ii)(II)(aa) or (B)(ii)(II)(aa), as applicable, distributions equal to the applicable highest historic payment, such that the distributions from the account are reduced under clause (i), the States and eligible counties shall receive, in addition to those payments from the Fund, any payments authorized for the State or eligible county under—

“(I) the sixth paragraph under the heading ‘FOREST SERVICE’ in the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260, chapter 192; 16 U.S.C. 500), and section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the ‘Weeks Law’) (36 Stat. 963, chapter 186; 16 U.S.C. 500);

“(II) subsection (a) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 875, chapter 876; 43 U.S.C. 2605);

“(III) the first section of the Act of May 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 753, chapter 144; 43 U.S.C. 2621); or

“(IV) section 401(c) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the ‘Refuge Revenue Sharing Act’) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c)).

“(3) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For each fiscal year, of the total amounts in the Fund, there shall be made available to the Corporation from the Fund for the payment of administrative expenses described in subparagraph (B)—

“(i) if the total amounts in the Fund as of the date of the determination is not less than \$100,000,000, an amount equal to the lesser of—

“(I) an amount equal to not more than 0.5 percent of the total amounts in the Fund, as of that date; and

“(II) \$30,000,000 (as adjusted to reflect changes during the period beginning on October 1, 2020, in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor); and

“(ii) if the total amounts in the Fund as of the date of the determination is less than \$100,000,000, an amount equal to not more than 1.0 percent of the total amounts in the Fund, as of that date.

“(B) USE.—Amounts made available for administrative expenses under subparagraph (A) may be used by the Corporation—

“(i) to ensure that amounts in Fund are managed in a manner consistent with the asset management strategies adopted under subsection (d)(1);

“(ii) to pay other administrative costs relating to the Fund, including the costs of managing the Fund, conducting audits of the Fund, and complying with reporting requirements relating to the Fund; and

“(iii) to reimburse members of the Board for actual and necessary traveling and subsistence expenses, in accordance with section 300204(h).

“(4) ELECTIONS TO OPT OUT AND OPT IN.—

“(A) OPTING OUT.—

“(i) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this chapter, a county described in clause (i) or (ii) of section 300201(6)(A) may make a 1-time election to opt out of distributions from the Fund under this chapter by submitting to the Secretary concerned a written notice of the election.

“(ii) EFFECT.—Subject to subparagraph (B), an election under clause (i) to opt out of distributions from the Fund shall be applicable for—

“(I) the fiscal year during which the notice under that clause is submitted; and

“(II) each subsequent fiscal year.

“(iii) NO EFFECT ON OTHER PAYMENTS.—An election by a county to opt out of distributions from the Fund under clause (i) shall not affect the eligibility of the county to receive any payment authorized for the county under—

“(I) the sixth paragraph under the heading ‘FOREST SERVICE’ in the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260, chapter 192; 16 U.S.C. 500), and section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the ‘Weeks Law’) (36 Stat. 963, chapter 186; 16 U.S.C. 500);

“(II) subsection (a) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 875, chapter 876; 43 U.S.C. 2605);

“(III) the first section of the Act of May 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 753, chapter 144; 43 U.S.C. 2621); or

“(IV) section 401(c) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the ‘Refuge Revenue Sharing Act’) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c)).

“(iv) TREATMENT.—A county described in clause (i) or (ii) of section 300201(6)(A) that has not submitted to the Secretary concerned a written notice of an election to opt out of distributions from the Fund under clause (i) shall be deemed to have opted in to those distributions.

“(B) NOTICE TO OPT IN.—A county that has elected to opt out of distributions from the Fund under subparagraph (A) may opt back in to the distributions for all subsequent fiscal years by submitting to the Secretary concerned, by not later than the date that is 2 years after the date on which the county submits the written notice under subparagraph (A)(i), a notice of the intent of the county to opt back in.

“(f) REPORTS.—

“(1) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this chapter and every 90 days thereafter, the Corporation shall submit to the Secretary of

the Treasury a quarterly report that describes, with full transparency, for the period covered by report—

“(A) the assets of the Fund, including a description of the investment policy used for the Fund; and

“(B) the performance of investments in the Fund.

“(2) ANNUAL REPORT.—Annually, the Corporation shall submit to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, and make publically available in an online searchable database in a machine-readable format, a report describing the activities of the Corporation for the period covered by the report, including, at a minimum, information relating to—

“(A) the growth of the Fund; and

“(B) applicable sources of revenue.

“(g) ANNUAL AUDITS.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this chapter and annually thereafter, the Inspector General of the Department of the Treasury shall conduct an audit of the Fund.

“(h) OVERSIGHT.—The Inspector General of the Department of the Treasury shall conduct periodic reviews of the exercise by the Corporation of the fiduciary and statutory duties of the Corporation.

“(i) FUNDING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Fund 110 percent of such sums as are necessary to ensure that the required minimum payment amounts under subsection (e)(2)(C)(i) can be provided.

“(2) ALLOCATION AMONG ACCOUNTS.—The amounts appropriated to the Fund under paragraph (1) shall be allocated among the Forest Service Account, the Bureau of Land Management Account, and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service Account in a manner that ensures that—

“(A) the amount allocated to the Forest Service Account is determined in accordance with the ratio that—

“(i) the total amount of State payments under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.) for fiscal year 2017; bears to

“(ii) an amount equal to the sum of—

“(I) the full funding amount for the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.) for fiscal year 2017; and

“(II) the total amount of payments to counties under section 401(c) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the ‘Refuge Revenue Sharing Act’) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c)), for fiscal year 2017;

“(B) the amount allocated to the Bureau of Land Management Account is determined in accordance with the ratio that—

“(i) the total amount of county payments under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.) for fiscal year 2017; bears to

“(ii) an amount equal to the sum of—

“(I) the full funding amount for the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.) for fiscal year 2017; and

“(II) the total amount of payments to counties under section 401(c) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the ‘Refuge Revenue Sharing Act’) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c)), for fiscal year 2017; and

“(C) the amount allocated to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service Account is determined in accordance with the ratio that—

“(i) the total amount of payments to counties under section 401(c) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the ‘Refuge Revenue Sharing Act’) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c)) for fiscal year 2017; bears to

“(ii) an amount equal to the sum of—

“(I) the full funding amount for the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.) for fiscal year 2017; and

“(II) the total amount of payments to counties under section 401(c) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the ‘Refuge Revenue Sharing Act’) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c)), for fiscal year 2017.

“(j) AGENCY REPORTING.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this chapter and annually thereafter, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the Corporation information describing activities on Federal land described in subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively, of section 3(7) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7102(7)), on a county-by-county basis, for the period covered by the report, including information regarding—

“(A) timber sales and associated acres treated, volumes sold and harvested, and revenues generated, including, at a minimum—

“(i) commercial treatment; and

“(ii) precommercial thinning;

“(B) stewardship projects, including, at a minimum—

“(i) commercial treatment;

“(ii) prescribed fire; and

“(iii) precommercial thinning;

“(C) road work;

“(D) reforestation and associated acres treated, including, at a minimum—

“(i) commercial treatment;

“(ii) prescribed fire; and

“(iii) precommercial thinning;

“(E) habitat created;

“(F) culverts replaced; and

“(G) miles of stream restoration.

“(2) PUBLICATION.—Promptly after receipt of the information under paragraph (1), the Corporation shall make the information publically available in an online searchable database in a machine-readable format.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle III of title 36, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 3001 the following:

“3002. Forest and Refuge County Foundation 300201”.

(c) TRANSFER OF AMOUNTS TO FUND.—

(1) DEFINITION OF ELIGIBLE NONELECTING COUNTY.—In this subsection, the term “eligible nonelecting county” means—

(A) in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), a county that—

(i) is eligible for a payment under the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7101 et seq.); and

(ii) has not elected to opt out of distributions from the Natural Resources Permanent Fund under section 300207(e)(4)(A) of title 36, United States Code; and

(B) in paragraph (5), a county that—

(i) is eligible for a payment under section 401(c) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the ‘Refuge Revenue Sharing Act’) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c)); and

(ii) has not elected to opt out of distributions from the Natural Resources Permanent Fund under section 300207(e)(4)(A) of title 36, United States Code.

(2) SUSPENSION OF PAYMENTS UNDER ACT OF MAY 23, 1908, AND ACT OF MARCH 1, 1911.—Except

as provided in section 300207(e)(2)(D)(ii) of title 36, United States Code, for fiscal year 2021 and each fiscal year thereafter—

(A) all payments authorized for eligible nonelecting counties under the sixth paragraph under the heading “FOREST SERVICE” in the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260, chapter 192; 16 U.S.C. 500), and section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the “Weeks Law”) (36 Stat. 963, chapter 186; 16 U.S.C. 500), shall be suspended; and

(B) the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Forest Service Account within the Natural Resources Permanent Fund established by section 300207(b)(1) of title 36, United States Code, amounts equal to the amounts that would have otherwise been distributed as payments to eligible nonelecting counties under the sixth paragraph under the heading “FOREST SERVICE” in the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260, chapter 192; 16 U.S.C. 500), and section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the “Weeks Law”) (36 Stat. 963, chapter 186; 16 U.S.C. 500).

(3) SUSPENSION OF PAYMENTS UNDER ACT OF AUGUST 28, 1937.—Except as provided in section 300207(e)(2)(D)(ii) of title 36, United States Code, for fiscal year 2021 and each fiscal year thereafter—

(A) all payments authorized for eligible nonelecting counties under subsection (a) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 875, chapter 876; 43 U.S.C. 2605), shall be suspended; and

(B) the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Bureau of Land Management Account within the Natural Resources Permanent Fund established by section 300207(b)(2) of title 36, United States Code, amounts equal to the amounts that would have otherwise been distributed as payments to eligible nonelecting counties under subsection (a) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 875, chapter 876; 43 U.S.C. 2605).

(4) SUSPENSION OF PAYMENTS UNDER ACT OF MAY 24, 1939.—Except as provided in section 300207(e)(2)(D)(ii) of title 36, United States Code, for fiscal year 2021 and each fiscal year thereafter—

(A) all payments authorized for eligible nonelecting counties under the first section of the Act of May 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 753, chapter 144; 43 U.S.C. 2621), shall be suspended; and

(B) the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Bureau of Land Management Account within the Natural Resources Permanent Fund established by section 300207(b)(2) of title 36, United States Code, amounts equal to the amounts that would have otherwise been distributed as payments to eligible nonelecting counties under the first section of the Act of May 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 753, chapter 144; 43 U.S.C. 2621).

(5) SUSPENSION OF PAYMENTS UNDER REFUGE REVENUE SHARING ACT.—Except as provided in section 300207(e)(2)(D)(ii) of title 36, United States Code, for fiscal year 2021 and each fiscal year thereafter—

(A) all payments authorized for eligible nonelecting counties under section 401(c) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the “Refuge Revenue Sharing Act”) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c)), shall be suspended; and

(B) the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service Account within the Natural Resources Permanent Fund established by section 300207(b)(3) of title 36, United States Code, amounts equal to the amounts that would have otherwise been distributed as payments to eligible nonelecting counties under section 401(c) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the “Refuge Revenue Sharing Act”) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c)).

(d) AMENDMENTS TO SECURE RURAL SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY SELF-DETERMINATION ACT OF 2000.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7102) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)(B), by striking “and paragraph (8)(A)”;

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in subparagraph (A)(ii), by inserting “described in paragraph (7)(A)” after “Federal land”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B)(ii), by striking “and paragraph (9)(B)(i)”;

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) has not elected to opt out of distributions from the Natural Resources Permanent Fund under section 300207(e)(4)(A) of title 36, United States Code.”;

(D) by striking paragraphs (8) and (9) and inserting the following:

“(8) 50-PERCENT ADJUSTED SHARE.—The term ‘50-percent adjusted share’ means the quotient obtained by dividing—

“(A) the number equal to the total of all 50-percent payments received by an eligible county during the eligibility period; by

“(B) the number equal to the sum of all 50-percent payments received by all eligible counties during the eligibility period.”;

(E) by redesignating paragraph (10) as paragraph (9);

(F) by striking paragraph (11) and inserting the following:

“(10) FULL FUNDING AMOUNT.—The term ‘full funding amount’ means—

“(A) for fiscal year 2008, \$500,000,000;

“(B) for each of fiscal years 2009 through 2011, an amount equal to 90 percent of the full funding amount for the preceding fiscal year;

“(C) for each of fiscal years 2012 through 2015, an amount equal to 95 percent of the full funding amount for the preceding fiscal year;

“(D) for fiscal year 2017, an amount equal to 95 percent of the full funding amount for fiscal year 2015;

“(E) for fiscal year 2018, an amount equal to 95 percent of the full funding amount for fiscal year 2017;

“(F) for fiscal year 2019, an amount equal to 95 percent of the full funding amount for fiscal year 2018;

“(G) for fiscal year 2020, an amount equal to 95 percent of the full funding amount for fiscal year 2019; and

“(H) for fiscal year 2021 and each fiscal year thereafter—

“(i) for purposes of the calculations under section 101(a), an amount equal to the greater of—

“(I) the amount distributed from the Forest Service Account within the Natural Resources Permanent Fund under section 300207(e)(2)(A) of title 36, United States Code; and

“(II) the total amount of all State payments for fiscal year 2017 (as adjusted to reflect changes during the period beginning on October 1, 2017, in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor); and

“(ii) for purposes of the calculations under section 101(b), an amount equal to the greater of—

“(I) the amount distributed from the Bureau of Land Management Account within the Natural Resources Permanent Fund under section 300207(e)(2)(A) of title 36, United States Code; and

“(II) the total amount of all county payments for fiscal year 2017 (as adjusted to reflect changes during the period beginning on October 1, 2017, in the Consumer Price Index for All Urban Consumers published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor).”;

(G) by redesignating paragraphs (12) through (17) as paragraphs (11) through (16), respectively; and

(H) in paragraph (11) (as so redesignated)—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “containing Federal land described in paragraph (7)(A)” after “eligible county”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (B), by inserting “containing Federal land described in paragraph (7)(A)” after “eligible counties”.

(2) PERMANENT AUTHORIZATION; SOURCE OF PAYMENT AMOUNTS.—

(A) CALCULATION OF PAYMENTS.—Section 101 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7111) is amended by striking “of fiscal years 2008 through 2015, 2017, 2018, 2019, and 2020” each place it appears and inserting “fiscal year”.

(B) ELECTIONS.—Section 102(b) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112(b)) is amended—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in subparagraph (A), by inserting “through fiscal year 2020” after “second fiscal year thereafter”; and

(II) by adding at the end the following:

“(E) FISCAL YEAR 2021 AND THEREAFTER.—For fiscal year 2021 and each fiscal year thereafter—

“(i) the election otherwise required by subparagraph (A) shall not apply; and

“(ii) each affected county shall receive payments in accordance with chapter 3002 of title 36, United States Code, unless the affected county elects to opt out of distributions under section 300207(e)(4)(A) of that title.”;

(ii) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking “through fiscal year 2015 and for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020”; and

(iii) by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) SOURCE OF PAYMENT AMOUNTS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—With respect to an eligible State or eligible county that has not elected to opt out of distributions under section 300207(e)(4)(A) of title 36, United States Code, the payment under this section for a fiscal year shall be derived from—

“(i) distributions to be paid under section 300207(e)(2)(A)(ii)(III)(aa) of title 36, United States Code; and

“(ii) to the extent that amounts made available under clause (i) are insufficient, any amounts that are appropriated to carry out this Act, to be distributed in accordance with section 300207(e)(2)(A)(ii)(III)(bb) of title 36, United States Code.

“(B) EXCEPTION.—An eligible State or eligible county that has elected to opt out of distributions under section 300207(e)(4)(A) of title 36, United States Code—

“(i) shall not receive any payment under this section; and

“(ii) may receive payments only under, as applicable—

“(I) the sixth paragraph under the heading ‘FOREST SERVICE’ in the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260, chapter 192; 16 U.S.C. 500), and section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the ‘Weeks Law’) (36 Stat. 963, chapter 186; 16 U.S.C. 500);

“(II) subsection (a) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 875, chapter 876; 43 U.S.C. 2605); and

“(III) the first section of the Act of May 24, 1939 (53 Stat. 753, chapter 144; 43 U.S.C. 2621).”.

(C) NOTIFICATION OF ELECTION.—Section 102(d)(1) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112(d)(1)) is amended—

(i) in subparagraph (A), by striking “subparagraph (D)” and inserting “subparagraphs (D) and (G)”; and

(ii) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) FISCAL YEAR 2021 AND THEREAFTER.—For fiscal year 2021 and each fiscal year thereafter—

“(i) the allocation of funds required under subparagraph (A) shall not be required;

“(ii) of the amounts received for the fiscal year—

“(I) 85 percent shall be expended in the same manner in which the 25-percent payments or 50-percent payments, as applicable, are required to be expended; and

“(II) 15 percent shall be expended on county projects in accordance with title III; and

“(iii) the elections otherwise required by subparagraphs (B), (C), and (D), or considered to be made under paragraph (3)(B), as applicable, shall not apply or be required for payments made for the fiscal year.”.

(D) DISTRIBUTION OF PAYMENTS TO ELIGIBLE COUNTIES.—Section 103(d)(2) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7113(d)(2)) is amended by striking “each of fiscal years 2011 through and for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2020” and inserting “fiscal year 2011 and each fiscal year thereafter”.

(3) PILOT PROGRAM TO STREAMLINE NOMINATION OF MEMBERS OF RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEES.—Section 205 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7125) is amended by striking subsection (g) and inserting the following:

“(g) RESOURCE ADVISORY COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT PILOT PROGRAMS.—

“(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

“(A) APPLICABLE DESIGNEE.—The term ‘applicable designee’ means the applicable regional forester.

“(B) NATIONAL PILOT PROGRAM.—The term ‘national pilot program’ means the national pilot program established under paragraph (4)(A).

“(C) REGIONAL PILOT PROGRAM.—The term ‘regional pilot program’ means the regional pilot program established under paragraph (3)(A).

“(2) ESTABLISHMENT OF PILOT PROGRAMS.—In accordance with paragraphs (3) and (4), the Secretary concerned shall carry out 2 pilot programs to appoint members of resource advisory committees.

“(3) REGIONAL PILOT PROGRAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary concerned shall carry out a regional pilot program to allow an applicable designee to appoint members of resource advisory committees.

“(B) GEOGRAPHIC LIMITATION.—The regional pilot program shall only apply to resource advisory committees chartered in—

“(i) the State of Montana; and

“(ii) the State of Arizona.

“(C) RESPONSIBILITIES OF APPLICABLE DESIGNEE.—

“(i) REVIEW.—Before appointing a member of a resource advisory committee under the regional pilot program, an applicable designee shall conduct the review and analysis that would otherwise be conducted for an appointment to a resource advisory committee if the regional pilot program was not in effect, including any review and analysis with respect to civil rights and budgetary requirements.

“(ii) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this paragraph relieves an applicable designee from any requirement developed by the Secretary concerned for making an appointment to a resource advisory committee that is in

effect on December 20, 2018, including any requirement for advertising a vacancy.

“(4) NATIONAL PILOT PROGRAM.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary concerned shall carry out a national pilot program to allow the Chief of the Forest Service or the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, as applicable, to submit to the Secretary concerned nominations of individuals for appointment as members of resource advisory committees.

“(B) APPOINTMENT.—Under the national pilot program, subject to subparagraph (C), not later than 30 days after the date on which a nomination is submitted to the Secretary concerned under subparagraph (A), the Secretary concerned shall—

“(i) appoint the nominee to the applicable resource advisory committee; or

“(ii) reject the nomination.

“(C) AUTOMATIC APPOINTMENT.—If the Secretary concerned does not act on a nomination in accordance with subparagraph (B) by the date described in that subparagraph, the nominee shall be deemed appointed to the applicable resource advisory committee.

“(D) GEOGRAPHIC LIMITATION.—The national pilot program shall apply to a resource advisory committee chartered in any State other than—

“(i) the State of Montana; or

“(ii) the State of Arizona.

“(E) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—Nothing in this paragraph relieves the Secretary concerned from any requirement relating to an appointment to a resource advisory committee, including any requirement with respect to civil rights or advertising a vacancy.

“(5) TERMINATION OF EFFECTIVENESS.—The authority provided under this subsection terminates on October 1, 2023.

“(6) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 180 days after the date described in paragraph (5), the Secretary concerned shall submit to Congress a report that includes—

“(A) with respect to appointments made under the regional pilot program compared to appointments made under the national pilot program, a description of the extent to which—

“(i) appointments were faster or slower; and

“(ii) the requirements described in paragraph (3)(C)(i) differ; and

“(B) a recommendation with respect to whether Congress should terminate, continue, modify, or expand the pilot programs.”.

(4) PROSPECTIVE REPEAL OF AUTHORITY TO CONDUCT SPECIAL PROJECTS ON FEDERAL LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Title II of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7121 et seq.) is repealed.

(B) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) Section 102(d) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7112(d)) is amended—

(I) in paragraph (1)—

(aa) in subparagraph (B)—

(AA) by striking clause (i);

(BB) by redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively; and

(CC) in clause (ii) (as so redesignated), by striking “clauses (i) and (ii)” and inserting “clause (i)”; and

(bb) in subparagraph (C)—

(AA) by striking clause (i);

(BB) by redesignating clauses (ii) and (iii) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively; and

(CC) in clause (ii) (as so redesignated), by striking “clauses (i) and (ii)” and inserting “clause (i)”; and

(cc) in subparagraphs (E) and (F), by striking “paragraph (3)(B)” each place it appears and inserting “paragraph (2)(B)”; and

(II) by striking paragraph (2);

(III) by redesignating paragraph (3) as paragraph (2); and

(IV) in subparagraph (B)(ii) of paragraph (2) (as so redesignated), by inserting “(as in effect on September 29, 2023)” after “204(a)(5)”;.

(ii) Section 302(b) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7142(b)) is amended—

(I) in paragraph (1), by striking “; and” at the end and inserting a period;

(II) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “shall—” and all that follows through “publish” in paragraph (1) and inserting “shall publish”; and

(III) by striking paragraph (2).

(iii) The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 is amended by striking section 403 (16 U.S.C. 7153) and inserting the following:

“SEC. 403. TREATMENT OF FUNDS.

“Funds made available under section 402 shall be in addition to any other annual appropriations for the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.”.

(iv) Section 603(b)(1)(C)(ii)(II) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591b(b)(1)(C)(ii)(II)) is amended by inserting “(as in effect on September 29, 2023)” before the period at the end.

(v) Section 4003(b)(2)(B)(ii) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7303(b)(2)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking “500 note)” and inserting “7125) (as in effect on September 29, 2023)”;.

(C) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subparagraphs (A) and (B) take effect on September 30, 2023.

(5) USE OF FUNDS.—Section 302(a) of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7142(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)(A), by striking “on Federal land”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “and” at the end;

(C) in paragraph (4), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

“(5) for job training or job creation activities;

“(6) for projects approved by—

“(A) a resource advisory committee; or

“(B) a forest collaborative;

“(7) for natural resource conservation projects;

“(8) for forest health treatments;

“(9) for economic development activities;

“(10) for transportation infrastructure projects on county road systems that serve Federal land;

“(11) to plan, develop, or carry out projects on Federal land that—

“(A) are consistent with applicable Federal laws (including regulations) and forest plans;

“(B) create private sector jobs, generate county revenue, or provide merchantable forest products; and

“(C) may include—

“(i) forest health treatments;

“(ii) implementation of work under a Master Stewardship Agreement;

“(iii) implementation of work under a good neighbor agreement (as defined in section 8206(a) of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (16 U.S.C. 2113a(a))); or

“(iv) forest road replacement, rehabilitation, or reconstruction; or

“(12) to provide or expand access to—

“(A) broadband telecommunications services at local schools; or

“(B) the technology and connectivity necessary for students to use a digital learning tool at or outside of a local school campus.”.

(6) CERTIFICATION.—Section 303 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7143) is amended—

(A) in subsection (a), by striking “February 1” and all that follows through “Secretary concerned” and inserting “February 1 of each calendar year beginning after a calendar year during which not less than \$35,000 of county funds were expended by a participating county, the appropriate official of the participating county shall submit to the Forest and Refuge County Foundation established by section 300202 of title 36, United States Code,”; and

(B) in subsection (b)—

(i) by striking “Secretary concerned shall” and inserting “Forest and Refuge County Foundation shall”; and

(ii) by striking “Secretary concerned determines” and inserting “Foundation determines”.

(7) AMOUNTS OBLIGATED BUT UNSPENT; PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 is amended by striking section 304 (16 U.S.C. 7144) and inserting the following:

“SEC. 304. AMOUNTS OBLIGATED BUT UNSPENT; PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.

“(a) AMOUNTS OBLIGATED BUT UNSPENT.—Any county funds that were obligated by the applicable participating county before October 1, 2017, but are unspent on October 1, 2020—

“(1) may, at the option of the participating county, be deemed to have been reserved by the participating county on October 1, 2020, for expenditure in accordance with this title; and

“(2)(A) may be used by the participating county for any authorized use under section 302(a); and

“(B) on a determination by the participating county under subparagraph (A) to use the county funds, shall be available for projects initiated after October 1, 2020.

“(b) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, effective beginning on the date of enactment of the Great American Outdoors Act, no county funds made available under this title may be used by any participating county for any lobbying activity, regardless of the purpose for which the funds are obligated on or before that date.”.

(8) FUNDING.—The Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 is amended by striking section 402 (16 U.S.C. 7152) and inserting the following:

“SEC. 402. FUNDING.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—On October 1 of each fiscal year, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary concerned such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act, to remain available until expended.

“(b) RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE.—The Secretary concerned shall be entitled to receive, shall accept, and shall use to carry out this section the funds transferred under subsection (a), without further appropriation.”.

(c) FUNDING FOR REFUGE REVENUE SHARING ACT.—

(1) SOURCE OF PAYMENTS TO COUNTIES.—Section 401(c) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the “Refuge Revenue Sharing Act”) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c)), is amended adding at the end the following:

“(6) SOURCE OF PAYMENTS TO COUNTIES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, for fiscal year 2021 and each fiscal year thereafter, with respect to counties that have not elected to opt out of distributions under section 300207(e)(4)(A) of title 36, United States Code, instead of making the payments to the applicable counties required under paragraphs (1) and (2) from the fund, the payments shall be derived from—

“(A) distributions to be paid under section 300207(e)(2)(B)(ii)(III)(aa)(AA) of title 36, United States Code; and

“(B) to the extent that amounts made available under subparagraph (A) are insufficient, any amounts that are appropriated under subsection (d), to be distributed in accordance with section 300207(e)(2)(B)(ii)(III)(bb) of title 36, United States Code.”.

(2) FUNDING.—Section 401 of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the “Refuge Revenue Sharing Act”) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s), is amended by striking subsection (d) and inserting the following:

“(d) FUNDING FOR PAYMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—On October 1 of each fiscal year, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the Secretary such sums as are necessary to make payments under paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (c) to counties, after taking into account—

“(A) amounts in the fund available for the payments for the fiscal year; and

“(B) amounts made available for payments from the National Resources Permanent Fund established by section 300207(a) of title 36, United States Code, for the fiscal year.

“(2) RECEIPT AND ACCEPTANCE.—The Secretary shall be entitled to receive, shall accept, and shall use to carry out this section the funds transferred under paragraph (1), without further appropriation.”.

(f) EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS FROM SEQUESTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 255(g)(1)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 905(g)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting after “Payments to Social Security Trust Funds (28–0404–0–1–651),” the following:

“Payments to States and eligible counties from the National Resources Permanent Fund established by section 300207(a) of title 36, United States Code.”.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to any sequestration order issued under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(g) CALCULATION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS UNDER THE PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES PROGRAM.—Section 6903(b) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) For purposes of calculating payments under this subsection, a payment to a unit of general local government from the National Resources Permanent Fund established by section 300207(a) of title 36 shall be treated as follows:

“(A) Payments from the Forest Service Account established under section 300207(b)(1) of title 36 shall be treated as payments made pursuant to the sixth paragraph under the heading ‘FOREST SERVICE’ in the Act of May 23, 1908 (35 Stat. 260, chapter 192; 16 U.S.C. 500), and section 13 of the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the ‘Weeks Law’) (36 Stat. 963, chapter 186; 16 U.S.C. 500).

“(B) Payments made from the Bureau of Land Management Account established under section 300207(b)(2) of title 36 shall be treated as payments made pursuant to subsection (a) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (50 Stat. 875, chapter 876; 43 U.S.C. 2605).

“(C) Payments made from the United States Fish and Wildlife Account established under section 300207(b)(3) of title 36 shall be treated the same as payments made pursuant to section 401(c)(2) of the Act of June 15, 1935 (commonly known as the ‘Refuge Revenue Sharing Act’) (49 Stat. 383, chapter 261; 16 U.S.C. 715s(c)(2)).”.

SA 1605. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . STOPPING THE SPREAD OF INVASIVE MUSSELS.

(a) BUREAU OF RECLAMATION ASSISTANCE.—(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) AQUATIC INVASIVE SPECIES.—The term “aquatic invasive species” has the meaning given the term “aquatic nuisance species” in section 1003 of the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4702).

(B) RECLAMATION STATE.—The term “reclamation State” has the meaning given the term in section 4014 of the Water Infrastructure Improvements for the Nation Act (43 U.S.C. 390b note; Public Law 114–322).

(C) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Commissioner of Reclamation.

(2) WATERCRAFT INSPECTION IN RECLAMATION STATES.—The Secretary shall provide financial assistance to a reclamation State to prevent the spread of aquatic invasive species into and out of reservoirs operated and maintained by the Secretary, including financial assistance to purchase, establish, operate, or maintain a watercraft inspection and decontamination station that has the highest likelihood of preventing the spread of aquatic invasive species at reservoirs operated and maintained by the Secretary, if the Secretary determines that the financial assistance is—

(A) necessary; and

(B) in the interests of the United States.

(3) COST SHARE.—The non-Federal share of the cost of purchasing, establishing, operating, and maintaining a watercraft inspection and decontamination station (including a non-Federal watercraft inspection and decontamination station) under paragraph (2), including personnel costs, shall be—

(A) not less than 50 percent; and

(B) provided by the reclamation State, or a unit of local government in the reclamation State, in which the watercraft inspection and decontamination station or other project is located.

(4) PRIORITY.—In providing financial assistance to a reclamation State under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall give priority to a project that—

(A) would prevent the spread of an aquatic invasive species to waters under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, including an irrigation, reclamation, or other water project; and

(B) aligns with—

(i) priorities of the reclamation State; and

(ii) the document submitted to the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force entitled “Quagga-Zebra Mussel Action Plan for Western U.S. Waters” and dated February 2010.

(5) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this subsection, the Secretary shall consult and coordinate with—

(A) each of the reclamation States;

(B) affected Indian Tribes; and

(C) the heads of appropriate Federal agencies.

(6) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this subsection \$25,000,000 for fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter.

(b) WATERCRAFT INSPECTION AND DECONTAMINATION AUTHORITY.—

(1) MANDATORY INSPECTION AND DECONTAMINATION.—

(A) DEFINITION OF TASK FORCE AGENCY.—In this paragraph, the term “task force agency” means any Federal agency the head of which is a member of the Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force under section 1201(b) of the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4721(b)).

(B) MANDATORY INSPECTION AND DECONTAMINATION.—To limit the movement of aquatic invasive species (as defined in subsection (a)(1)) into or out of the waters of the United States, each task force agency may, as appropriate—

(i) conduct mandatory inspections and decontamination of watercraft; and

(ii) if necessary, impound, quarantine, or otherwise prevent entry of a watercraft.

(2) AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES TASK FORCE.—Section 1201(b) of the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4721(b)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (6), by striking “and” at the end;

(B) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (10); and

(C) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

“(7) the Director of the National Park Service;

“(8) the Director of the Bureau of Land Management;

“(9) the Commissioner of Reclamation; and”.

(3) AQUATIC NUISANCE SPECIES PROGRAM.—Section 1202 of the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4722) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)—

(i) in paragraph (5), by striking “and” at the end;

(ii) in paragraph (6), by striking the period at the end and inserting “; and”; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

“(7) not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this paragraph, recommend legislative or regulatory changes to eliminate remaining gaps in authorities between members of the Task Force to effectively manage and control the movement of aquatic nuisance species into or out of waters of the United States.”; and

(B) in subsection (e)—

(i) in paragraph (1)—

(I) in the first sentence, by inserting “, economy, infrastructure,” after “environment”; and

(II) in the second sentence, by inserting “(including through the use of watercraft inspection and decontamination stations)” after “aquatic nuisance species”; and

(ii) in paragraph (2), in the second sentence, by inserting “infrastructure, and the” after “ecosystems.”.

(c) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Section 104(d) of the River and Harbor Act of 1958 (33 U.S.C. 610(d)) is amended—

(1) in the subsection heading, by inserting “AND DECONTAMINATION” after “INSPECTION”; and

(2) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A)—

(i) in the subparagraph heading, by inserting “AND DECONTAMINATION” after “INSPECTION”; and

(ii) in clause (iii), by striking “Arizona” and inserting “Arkansas”; and

(B) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(B) LOCATIONS.—The Secretary shall place watercraft inspection and decontamination stations under subparagraph (A) at locations with the highest likelihood of preventing the spread of aquatic invasive species into and out of waters of the United States, as determined by the Secretary in consultation with the Governors and entities described in paragraph (3).”; and

(3) by striking “watercraft inspection stations” each place it appears and inserting “watercraft inspection and decontamination stations”.

SA 1606. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. EVERY WORD WE UTTER MONUMENT COMMEMORATIVE WORK.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) a monument as a tribute to the magnitude of the effort of suffragists over a period of 7 decades to pass the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States in a way that engages the viewer and serves as a call to action for present and future generations is appropriate on Federal land;

(2) the monument described in paragraph (1) should include—

(A) a sculptural portrait to honor Susan B. Anthony, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, Harriot Stanton Blatch, Sojourner Truth, Alice Paul, and Ida B. Wells; and

(B) a depiction of the Declaration of Sentiments and Ratification Flag with the names of other women instrumental in fighting for women’s suffrage included in the depiction of the word “WE” of the Declaration of Sentiments with raised lettering on ripples radiating from the monument; and

(3) the preferred site location for the monument is Area II, near Belmont-Paul National Monument and the Supreme Court.

(b) AUTHORIZATION TO ESTABLISH COMMEMORATIVE WORK.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Every Word We Utter Monument may establish a commemorative work on Federal land in the District of Columbia and its environs (as defined in section 8902(a) of title 40, United States Code), to commemorate the passage of the 19th Amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which gave women the right to vote.

(2) COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS.—The establishment of the commemorative work under this subsection shall be in accordance with chapter 89 of title 40, United States Code (commonly known as the “Commemorative Works Act”).

(3) PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Federal funds may not be used to pay any expense of the establishment of the commemorative work under this subsection.

(B) RESPONSIBILITY OF MONUMENT.—The Every Word We Utter Monument shall be solely responsible for acceptance of contributions for, and payment of the expenses of, the establishment of the commemorative work under this subsection.

(4) DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If, on payment of all expenses for the establishment of the commemorative work under this subsection (including the maintenance and preservation amount required by section 8906(b)(1) of title 40, United States Code), there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the commemorative work, the Every Word We Utter Monument shall transmit the amount of the balance to the Secretary of the Interior for deposit in the account provided for in section 8906(b)(3) of title 40, United States Code.

(B) ON EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—If, on expiration of the authority for the com-

memorative work under section 8903(e) of title 40, United States Code, there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the commemorative work under this subsection, the Every Word We Utter Monument shall transmit the amount of the balance to a separate account with the National Park Foundation for memorials, to be available to the Secretary of the Interior or Administrator of General Services, as appropriate, in accordance with the process provided in section 8906(b)(4) of title 40, United States Code, for accounts established under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 8906(b) of title 40, United States Code.

SA 1607. Mr. BENNET submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

TITLE II—COLORADO OUTDOOR RECREATION AND ECONOMY

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the “Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act”.

SEC. 202. DEFINITION OF STATE.

In this title, the term “State” means the State of Colorado.

SEC. 203. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this title, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this title, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

Subtitle A—Continental Divide

SEC. 211. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) COVERED AREA.—The term “covered area” means any area designated as wilderness by the amendments to section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) made by section 212(a).

(2) HISTORIC LANDSCAPE.—The term “Historic Landscape” means the Camp Hale National Historic Landscape designated by section 217(a).

(3) RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREA.—The term “Recreation Management Area” means the Tenmile Recreation Management Area designated by section 214(a).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(5) WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AREA.—The term “Wildlife Conservation Area” means, as applicable—

(A) the Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area designated by section 215(a); and

(B) the Williams Fork Mountains Wildlife Conservation Area designated by section 216(a).

SEC. 212. COLORADO WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (18), by striking “1993,” and inserting “1993, and certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 6,896 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Ptarmigan Peak Wilderness Additions’ on the map entitled ‘Proposed Ptarmigan Peak Wilderness Additions’ and dated June 24, 2019,”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(23) HOLY CROSS WILDERNESS ADDITION.—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 3,866 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Megan Dickie Wilderness Addition’ on the map entitled ‘Holy Cross Wilderness Addition Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be incorporated into, and managed as part of, the Holy Cross Wilderness designated by section 102(a)(5) of Public Law 96–560 (94 Stat. 3266).

“(24) HOOSIER RIDGE WILDERNESS.—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 5,235 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Hoosier Ridge Wilderness’ on the map entitled ‘Tenmile Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be known as the ‘Hoosier Ridge Wilderness’.

“(25) TENMILE WILDERNESS.—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 7,624 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Tenmile Wilderness’ on the map entitled ‘Tenmile Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be known as the ‘Tenmile Wilderness’.

“(26) EAGLES NEST WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 9,670 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Freeman Creek Wilderness Addition’ and ‘Proposed Spraddle Creek Wilderness Addition’ on the map entitled ‘Eagles Nest Wilderness Additions Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be incorporated into, and managed as part of, the Eagles Nest Wilderness designated by Public Law 94–352 (90 Stat. 870).”.

(b) APPLICABLE LAW.—Any reference in the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act for purposes of administering a covered area.

(c) FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary may carry out any activity in a covered area that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(d) GRAZING.—The grazing of livestock on a covered area, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are considered to be necessary by the Secretary, in accordance with—

(1) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(2) the guidelines set forth in Appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (H. Rept. 101–405).

(e) COORDINATION.—For purposes of administering the Federal land designated as wilderness by paragraph (26) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by subsection (a)(2)), the Secretary shall, as determined to be appropriate for the protection of watersheds, coordinate the activities of the Secretary in response to fires and flooding events with interested State and local agencies, including operations using aircraft or mechanized equipment.

SEC. 213. WILLIAMS FORK MOUNTAINS WILDERNESS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), certain Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State, comprising approximately 8,036 acres, as generally depicted as “Proposed Williams Fork Mountains Wilderness” on the map entitled

“Williams Fork Mountains Proposal” and dated June 24, 2019, is designated as a potential wilderness area.

(b) MANAGEMENT.—Subject to valid existing rights and except as provided in subsection (d), the potential wilderness area designated by subsection (a) shall be managed in accordance with—

(1) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and

(2) this section.

(c) LIVESTOCK USE OF VACANT ALLOTMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the Secretary shall publish a determination regarding whether to authorize livestock grazing or other use by livestock on the vacant allotments known as—

(A) the “Big Hole Allotment”; and

(B) the “Blue Ridge Allotment”.

(2) MODIFICATION OF ALLOTMENTS.—In publishing a determination pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary may modify or combine the vacant allotments referred to in that paragraph.

(3) PERMIT OR OTHER AUTHORIZATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which a determination of the Secretary to authorize livestock grazing or other use by livestock is published under paragraph (1), if applicable, the Secretary shall grant a permit or other authorization for that livestock grazing or other use in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations).

(d) RANGE IMPROVEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Secretary permits livestock grazing or other use by livestock on the potential wilderness area under subsection (c), the Secretary, or a third party authorized by the Secretary, may use any motorized or mechanized transport or equipment for purposes of constructing or rehabilitating such range improvements as are necessary to obtain appropriate livestock management objectives (including habitat and watershed restoration).

(2) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The authority provided by this subsection terminates on the date that is 2 years after the date on which the Secretary publishes a positive determination under subsection (c)(3).

(e) DESIGNATION AS WILDERNESS.—

(1) DESIGNATION.—The potential wilderness area designated by subsection (a) shall be designated as wilderness, to be known as the “Williams Fork Mountains Wilderness”.

(A) effective not earlier than the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) on the earliest of—

(i) the date on which the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register a notice that the construction or rehabilitation of range improvements under subsection (d) is complete;

(ii) the date described in subsection (d)(2); and

(iii) the effective date of a determination of the Secretary not to authorize livestock grazing or other use by livestock under subsection (c)(1).

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall manage the Williams Fork Mountains Wilderness in accordance with—

(A) the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77); and

(B) this subtitle.

SEC. 214. TENMILE RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREA.

(a) DESIGNATION.—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 17,122 acres of Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State, as generally depicted as “Proposed Tenmile Recreation Management Area” on the map entitled “Tenmile Pro-

posal” and dated June 24, 2019, are designated as the “Tenmile Recreation Management Area”.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the Recreation Management Area are to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the recreational, scenic, watershed, habitat, and ecological resources of the Recreation Management Area.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the Recreation Management Area—

(A) in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances—

(i) the purposes of the Recreation Management Area described in subsection (b); and

(ii) recreation opportunities, including mountain biking, hiking, fishing, horseback riding, snowshoeing, climbing, skiing, camping, and hunting; and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);

(ii) any other applicable laws (including regulations); and

(iii) this section.

(2) USES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall only allow such uses of the Recreation Management Area as the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in subsection (b).

(B) VEHICLES.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (iii), the use of motorized vehicles in the Recreation Management Area shall be limited to the roads, vehicle classes, and periods authorized for motorized vehicle use on the date of enactment of this Act.

(ii) NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.—Except as provided in clause (iii), no new or temporary road shall be constructed in the Recreation Management Area.

(iii) EXCEPTIONS.—Nothing in clause (i) or (ii) prevents the Secretary from—

(I) rerouting or closing an existing road or trail to protect natural resources from degradation, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate;

(II) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles for administrative purposes or roadside camping;

(III) constructing temporary roads or permitting the use of motorized vehicles to carry out pre- or post-fire watershed protection projects;

(IV) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles to carry out any activity described in subsection (d), (e)(1), or (f); or

(V) responding to an emergency.

(C) COMMERCIAL TIMBER.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Subject to clause (ii), no project shall be carried out in the Recreation Management Area for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber.

(ii) LIMITATION.—Nothing in clause (i) prevents the Secretary from harvesting or selling a merchantable product that is a byproduct of an activity authorized under this section.

(d) FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.—The Secretary may carry out any activity, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), that the Secretary determines to be necessary to prevent, control, or mitigate fire, insects, or disease in the Recreation Management Area, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(e) WATER.—

(1) EFFECT ON WATER MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE.—Nothing in this section affects the construction, repair, reconstruction, replacement, operation, maintenance, or renovation within the Recreation Management Area of—

(A) water management infrastructure in existence on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) any future infrastructure necessary for the development or exercise of water rights decreed before the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Section 3(e) of the James Peak Wilderness and Protection Area Act (Public Law 107–216; 116 Stat. 1058) shall apply to the Recreation Management Area.

(f) **REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.**—Nothing in this section precludes the Secretary from authorizing, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the use or leasing of Federal land within the Recreation Management Area for—

(1) a regional transportation project, including—

(A) highway widening or realignment; and
(B) construction of multimodal transportation systems; or

(2) any infrastructure, activity, or safety measure associated with the implementation or use of a facility constructed under paragraph (1).

(g) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Nothing in this section affects the designation of the Federal land within the Recreation Management Area for purposes of—

(1) section 138 of title 23, United States Code; or

(2) section 303 of title 49, United States Code.

(h) **PERMITS.**—Nothing in this section alters or limits—

(1) any permit held by a ski area or other entity; or

(2) the acceptance, review, or implementation of associated activities or facilities proposed or authorized by law or permit outside the boundaries of the Recreation Management Area.

SEC. 215. PORCUPINE GULCH WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 8,287 acres of Federal land located in the White River National Forest, as generally depicted as “Proposed Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area” on the map entitled “Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area Proposal” and dated June 24, 2019, are designated as the “Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area” (referred to in this section as the “Wildlife Conservation Area”).

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the Wildlife Conservation Area are—

(1) to conserve and protect a wildlife migration corridor over Interstate 70; and

(2) to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the wildlife, scenic, roadless, watershed, and ecological resources of the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(c) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the Wildlife Conservation Area—

(A) in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);

(ii) any other applicable laws (including regulations); and

(iii) this section.

(2) **USES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall only allow such uses of the Wildlife Conservation Area as the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in subsection (b).

(B) **RECREATION.**—The Secretary may permit such recreational activities in the Wildlife Conservation Area that the Secretary determines are consistent with the purposes described in subsection (b).

(C) **MOTORIZED VEHICLES AND MECHANIZED TRANSPORT; NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.**—

(i) **MOTORIZED VEHICLES AND MECHANIZED TRANSPORT.**—Except as provided in clause (iii), the use of motorized vehicles and mechanized transport in the Wildlife Conservation Area shall be prohibited.

(ii) **NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.**—Except as provided in clause (iii) and subsection (e), no new or temporary road shall be constructed within the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(iii) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Nothing in clause (i) or (ii) prevents the Secretary from—

(I) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport for administrative purposes;

(II) constructing temporary roads or permitting the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport to carry out pre- or post-fire watershed protection projects;

(III) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport to carry out activities described in subsection (d) or (e); or

(IV) responding to an emergency.

(D) **COMMERCIAL TIMBER.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to clause (ii), no project shall be carried out in the Wildlife Conservation Area for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber.

(ii) **LIMITATION.**—Nothing in clause (i) prevents the Secretary from harvesting or selling a merchantable product that is a byproduct of an activity authorized under this section.

(d) **FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.**—The Secretary may carry out any activity, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), that the Secretary determines to be necessary to prevent, control, or mitigate fire, insects, or disease in the Wildlife Conservation Area, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(e) **REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.**—Nothing in this section or section 220(e) precludes the Secretary from authorizing, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the use or leasing of Federal land within the Wildlife Conservation Area for—

(1) a regional transportation project, including—

(A) highway widening or realignment; and
(B) construction of multimodal transportation systems; or

(2) any infrastructure, activity, or safety measure associated with the implementation or use of a facility constructed under paragraph (1).

(f) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Nothing in this section affects the designation of the Federal land within the Wildlife Conservation Area for purposes of—

(1) section 138 of title 23, United States Code; or

(2) section 303 of title 49, United States Code.

(g) **WATER.**—Section 3(e) of the James Peak Wilderness and Protection Area Act (Public Law 107–216; 116 Stat. 1058) shall apply to the Wildlife Conservation Area.

SEC. 216. WILLIAMS FORK MOUNTAINS WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 3,528 acres of Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State, as generally depicted as “Proposed Williams Fork Mountains Wildlife Conservation Area” on the map entitled “Williams Fork Mountains Proposal” and dated June 24, 2019, are designated as the “Williams Fork Mountains Wildlife Conservation Area” (referred to in this section as the “Wildlife Conservation Area”).

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the Wildlife Conservation Area are to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the wildlife, scenic, roadless, watershed, rec-

reational, and ecological resources of the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(c) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the Wildlife Conservation Area—

(A) in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances the purposes described in subsection (b); and

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);

(ii) any other applicable laws (including regulations); and

(iii) this section.

(2) **USES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall only allow such uses of the Wildlife Conservation Area as the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in subsection (b).

(B) **MOTORIZED VEHICLES.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (iii), the use of motorized vehicles in the Wildlife Conservation Area shall be limited to designated roads and trails.

(ii) **NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.**—Except as provided in clause (iii), no new or temporary road shall be constructed in the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(iii) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Nothing in clause (i) or (ii) prevents the Secretary from—

(I) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles for administrative purposes;

(II) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles to carry out activities described in subsection (d); or

(III) responding to an emergency.

(C) **BICYCLES.**—The use of bicycles in the Wildlife Conservation Area shall be limited to designated roads and trails.

(D) **COMMERCIAL TIMBER.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to clause (ii), no project shall be carried out in the Wildlife Conservation Area for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber.

(ii) **LIMITATION.**—Nothing in clause (i) prevents the Secretary from harvesting or selling a merchantable product that is a byproduct of an activity authorized under this section.

(E) **GRAZING.**—The laws (including regulations) and policies followed by the Secretary in issuing and administering grazing permits or leases on land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary shall continue to apply with regard to the land in the Wildlife Conservation Area, consistent with the purposes described in subsection (b).

(d) **FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.**—The Secretary may carry out any activity, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), that the Secretary determines to be necessary to prevent, control, or mitigate fire, insects, or disease in the Wildlife Conservation Area, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(e) **REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.**—Nothing in this section or section 220(e) precludes the Secretary from authorizing, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the use or leasing of Federal land within the Wildlife Conservation Area for—

(1) a regional transportation project, including—

(A) highway widening or realignment; and
(B) construction of multimodal transportation systems; or

(2) any infrastructure, activity, or safety measure associated with the implementation or use of a facility constructed under paragraph (1).

(f) **WATER.**—Section 3(e) of the James Peak Wilderness and Protection Area Act (Public Law 107–216; 116 Stat. 1058) shall apply to the Wildlife Conservation Area.

SEC. 217. CAMP HALE NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDSCAPE.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 28,676 acres of Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State, as generally depicted as “Proposed Camp Hale National Historic Landscape” on the map entitled “Camp Hale National Historic Landscape Proposal” and dated June 24, 2019, are designated the “Camp Hale National Historic Landscape”.

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the Historic Landscape are—

(1) to provide for—

(A) the interpretation of historic events, activities, structures, and artifacts of the Historic Landscape, including with respect to the role of the Historic Landscape in local, national, and world history;

(B) the historic preservation of the Historic Landscape, consistent with—

(i) the designation of the Historic Landscape as a national historic site; and

(ii) the other purposes of the Historic Landscape;

(C) recreational opportunities, with an emphasis on the activities related to the historic use of the Historic Landscape, including skiing, snowshoeing, snowmobiling, hiking, horseback riding, climbing, other road- and trail-based activities, and other outdoor activities; and

(D) the continued environmental remediation and removal of unexploded ordnance at the Camp Hale Formerly Used Defense Site and the Camp Hale historic cantonment area; and

(2) to conserve, protect, restore, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the scenic, watershed, and ecological resources of the Historic Landscape.

(c) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the Historic Landscape in accordance with—

(A) the purposes of the Historic Landscape described in subsection (b); and

(B) any other applicable laws (including regulations).

(2) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a management plan for the Historic Landscape.

(B) **CONTENTS.**—The management plan prepared under subparagraph (A) shall include plans for—

(i) improving the interpretation of historic events, activities, structures, and artifacts of the Historic Landscape, including with respect to the role of the Historic Landscape in local, national, and world history;

(ii) conducting historic preservation and veteran outreach and engagement activities;

(iii) managing recreational opportunities, including the use and stewardship of—

(I) the road and trail systems; and

(II) dispersed recreation resources;

(iv) the conservation, protection, restoration, or enhancement of the scenic, watershed, and ecological resources of the Historic Landscape, including conducting the restoration and enhancement project under subsection (d); and

(v) environmental remediation and, consistent with subsection (e)(2), the removal of unexploded ordnance.

(3) **EXPLOSIVE HAZARDS.**—The Secretary shall provide to the Secretary of the Army a notification of any unexploded ordnance (as defined in section 101(e) of title 10, United States Code) that is discovered in the Historic Landscape.

(d) **CAMP HALE RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT PROJECT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall conduct a restoration and enhancement project in the Historic Landscape—

(A) to improve aquatic, riparian, and wetland conditions in and along the Eagle River and tributaries of the Eagle River;

(B) to maintain or improve recreation and interpretive opportunities and facilities; and

(C) to conserve historic values in the Camp Hale area.

(2) **COORDINATION.**—In carrying out the project described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall coordinate with—

(A) the Corps of Engineers;

(B) the Camp Hale-Eagle River Headwaters Collaborative Group;

(C) the National Forest Foundation;

(D) the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment;

(E) the Colorado State Historic Preservation Office;

(F) units of local government; and

(G) other interested organizations and members of the public.

(e) **ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Army shall continue to carry out the projects and activities of the Department of the Army in existence on the date of enactment of this Act relating to cleanup of—

(A) the Camp Hale Formerly Used Defense Site; or

(B) the Camp Hale historic cantonment area.

(2) **REMOVAL OF UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary of the Army may remove unexploded ordnance (as defined in section 101(e) of title 10, United States Code) from the Historic Landscape, as the Secretary of the Army determines to be appropriate in accordance with applicable law (including regulations).

(B) **ACTION ON RECEIPT OF NOTICE.**—On receipt from the Secretary of a notification of unexploded ordnance under subsection (c)(3), the Secretary of the Army may remove the unexploded ordnance in accordance with—

(i) the program for environmental restoration of formerly used defense sites under section 2701 of title 10, United States Code;

(ii) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.); and

(iii) any other applicable provision of law (including regulations).

(3) **EFFECT OF SUBSECTION.**—Nothing in this subsection modifies any obligation in existence on the date of enactment of this Act relating to environmental remediation or removal of any unexploded ordnance located in or around the Camp Hale historic cantonment area, the Camp Hale Formerly Used Defense Site, or the Historic Landscape, including such an obligation under—

(A) the program for environmental restoration of formerly used defense sites under section 2701 of title 10, United States Code;

(B) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.); or

(C) any other applicable provision of law (including regulations).

(f) **INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.**—The Secretary and the Secretary of the Army shall enter into an agreement—

(1) to specify—

(A) the activities of the Secretary relating to the management of the Historic Landscape; and

(B) the activities of the Secretary of the Army relating to environmental remediation and the removal of unexploded ordnance in accordance with subsection (e) and other applicable laws (including regulations); and

(2) to require the Secretary to provide to the Secretary of the Army, by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and periodically thereafter, as appro-

priate, a management plan for the Historic Landscape for purposes of the removal activities described in subsection (e).

(g) **EFFECT.**—Nothing in this section—

(1) affects the jurisdiction of the State over any water law, water right, or adjudication or administration relating to any water resource;

(2) affects any water right in existence on or after the date of enactment of this Act, or the exercise of such a water right, including—

(A) a water right under an interstate water compact (including full development of any apportionment made in accordance with such a compact);

(B) a water right decreed within, above, below, or through the Historic Landscape;

(C) a water right held by the United States;

(D) the management or operation of any reservoir, including the storage, management, release, or transportation of water; and

(E) the construction or operation of such infrastructure as is determined to be necessary by an individual or entity holding water rights to develop and place to beneficial use those rights, subject to applicable Federal, State, and local law (including regulations);

(3) constitutes an express or implied reservation by the United States of any reserved or appropriative water right;

(4) alters or limits—

(A) a permit held by a ski area;

(B) the implementation of activities governed by a ski area permit; or

(C) the authority of the Secretary to modify or expand an existing ski area permit;

(5) prevents the Secretary from closing portions of the Historic Landscape for public safety, environmental remediation, or other use in accordance with applicable laws; or

(6) affects—

(A) any special use permit in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) the renewal of a permit described in subparagraph (A).

(h) **FUNDING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—There is established in the general fund of the Treasury a special account, to be known as the “Camp Hale Historic Preservation and Restoration Fund”.

(2) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Camp Hale Historic Preservation and Restoration Fund \$10,000,000, to be available to the Secretary until expended, for activities relating to historic interpretation, preservation, and restoration carried out in and around the Historic Landscape.

(i) **DESIGNATION OF OVERLOOK.**—The interpretive site located beside United States Route 24 in the State, at 39.431N 106.323W, is designated as the “Sandy Treat Overlook”.

SEC. 218. WHITE RIVER NATIONAL FOREST BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The boundary of the White River National Forest is modified to include the approximately 120 acres comprised of the SW¼, the SE¼, and the NE¼ of the SE¼ of sec. 1, T. 2 S., R. 80 W., 6th Principal Meridian, in Summit County in the State.

(b) **LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.**—For purposes of section 200306 of title 54, United States Code, the boundaries of the White River National Forest, as modified by subsection (a), shall be considered to be the boundaries of the White River National Forest as in existence on January 1, 1965.

SEC. 219. ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK POTENTIAL WILDERNESS BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.

(a) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of this section is to provide for the ongoing maintenance and use of portions of the Trail River Ranch

and the associated property located within Rocky Mountain National Park in Grand County in the State.

(b) **BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.**—Section 1952(b) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111-11; 123 Stat. 1070) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.**—The boundary of the Potential Wilderness is modified to exclude the area comprising approximately 15.5 acres of land identified as ‘Potential Wilderness to Non-wilderness’ on the map entitled ‘Rocky Mountain National Park Proposed Wilderness Area Amendment’ and dated January 16, 2018.”.

SEC. 220. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) **FISH AND WILDLIFE.**—Nothing in this subtitle affects the jurisdiction or responsibility of the State with respect to fish and wildlife in the State.

(b) **NO BUFFER ZONES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this subtitle or an amendment made by this subtitle establishes a protective perimeter or buffer zone around—

- (A) a covered area;
- (B) a wilderness area or potential wilderness area designated by section 213;
- (C) the Recreation Management Area;
- (D) a Wildlife Conservation Area; or
- (E) the Historic Landscape.

(2) **OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES.**—The fact that a nonwilderness activity or use on land outside of a covered area can be seen or heard from within the covered area shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the covered area.

(c) **MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall file maps and legal descriptions of each area described in subsection (b)(1) with—

(A) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) **FORCE OF LAW.**—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this subtitle, except that the Secretary may correct any typographical errors in the maps and legal descriptions.

(3) **PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.**—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(d) **ACQUISITION OF LAND.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may acquire any land or interest in land within the boundaries of an area described in subsection (b)(1) only through exchange, donation, or purchase from a willing seller.

(2) **MANAGEMENT.**—Any land or interest in land acquired under paragraph (1) shall be incorporated into, and administered as a part of, the wilderness area, Recreation Management Area, Wildlife Conservation Area, or Historic Landscape, as applicable, in which the land or interest in land is located.

(e) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, the areas described in subsection (b)(1) are withdrawn from—

(1) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(f) **MILITARY OVERFLIGHTS.**—Nothing in this subtitle or an amendment made by this subtitle restricts or precludes—

(1) any low-level overflight of military aircraft over any area subject to this subtitle or

an amendment made by this subtitle, including military overflights that can be seen, heard, or detected within such an area;

(2) flight testing or evaluation over an area described in paragraph (1); or

(3) the use or establishment of—

(A) any new unit of special use airspace over an area described in paragraph (1); or

(B) any military flight training or transportation over such an area.

(g) **SENSE OF CONGRESS.**—It is the sense of Congress that military aviation training on Federal public land in the State, including the training conducted at the High-Altitude Army National Guard Aviation Training Site, is critical to the national security of the United States and the readiness of the Armed Forces.

Subtitle B—San Juan Mountains

SEC. 221. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) **COVERED LAND.**—The term “covered land” means—

(A) land designated as wilderness under paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) (as added by section 222); and

(B) a Special Management Area.

(2) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(3) **SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.**—The term “Special Management Area” means each of—

(A) the Sheep Mountain Special Management Area designated by section 223(a)(1); and

(B) the Liberty Bell East Special Management Area designated by section 223(a)(2).

SEC. 222. ADDITIONS TO NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.

Section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) (as amended by section 212(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(27) **LIZARD HEAD WILDERNESS ADDITION.**—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 3,141 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Wilson, Sunshine, Black Face and San Bernardo Additions to the Lizard Head Wilderness’ and dated September 6, 2018, which is incorporated in, and shall be administered as part of, the Lizard Head Wilderness.

“(28) **MOUNT SNEFFELS WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.**—

“(A) **LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.**—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Additions to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness, Liberty Bell East Special Management Area’ and dated September 6, 2018, which is incorporated in, and shall be administered as part of, the Mount Sneffels Wilderness.

“(B) **WHITEHOUSE ADDITIONS.**—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 12,465 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Whitehouse Additions to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness’ and dated September 6, 2018, which is incorporated in, and shall be administered as part of, the Mount Sneffels Wilderness.

“(29) **MCKENNA PEAK WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land in the State of Colorado comprising approximately 8,884 acres of Bureau of Land Management land, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed McKenna Peak Wilderness Area’ and dated September 18, 2018, to be known as the ‘McKenna Peak Wilderness’.”.

SEC. 223. SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—

(1) **SHEEP MOUNTAIN SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.**—The Federal land in the Grand Mesa,

Uncompahgre, and Gunnison and San Juan National Forests in the State comprising approximately 21,663 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Sheep Mountain Special Management Area” and dated September 19, 2018, is designated as the “Sheep Mountain Special Management Area”.

(2) **LIBERTY BELL EAST SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.**—The Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests in the State comprising approximately 792 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Additions to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness, Liberty Bell East Special Management Area” and dated September 6, 2018, is designated as the “Liberty Bell East Special Management Area”.

(b) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the Special Management Areas is to conserve and protect for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the geological, cultural, archaeological, paleontological, natural, scientific, recreational, wilderness, wildlife, riparian, historical, educational, and scenic resources of the Special Management Areas.

(c) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the Special Management Areas in a manner that—

(A) conserves, protects, and enhances the resources and values of the Special Management Areas described in subsection (b);

(B) subject to paragraph (3), maintains or improves the wilderness character of the Special Management Areas and the suitability of the Special Management Areas for potential inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System; and

(C) is in accordance with—

(i) the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);

(ii) this subtitle; and

(iii) any other applicable laws.

(2) **PROHIBITIONS.**—The following shall be prohibited in the Special Management Areas:

(A) Permanent roads.

(B) Except as necessary to meet the minimum requirements for the administration of the Federal land, to provide access for abandoned mine cleanup, and to protect public health and safety—

(i) the use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or mechanical transport (other than as provided in paragraph (3)); and

(ii) the establishment of temporary roads.

(3) **AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may allow any activities (including helicopter access for recreation and maintenance and the competitive running event permitted since 1992) that have been authorized by permit or license as of the date of enactment of this Act to continue within the Special Management Areas, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(B) **PERMITTING.**—The designation of the Special Management Areas by subsection (a) shall not affect the issuance of permits relating to the activities covered under subparagraph (A) after the date of enactment of this Act.

(C) **BICYCLES.**—The Secretary may permit the use of bicycles in—

(i) the portion of the Sheep Mountain Special Management Area identified as “Ophir Valley Area” on the map entitled “Proposed Sheep Mountain Special Management Area” and dated September 19, 2018; and

(ii) the portion of the Liberty Bell East Special Management Area identified as “Liberty Bell Corridor” on the map entitled “Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Additions to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness, Liberty Bell East Special Management Area” and dated September 6, 2018.

(d) APPLICABLE LAW.—Water and water rights in the Special Management Areas shall be administered in accordance with section 8 of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-77; 107 Stat. 762), except that, for purposes of this subtitle—

(1) any reference contained in that section to “the lands designated as wilderness by this Act”, “the Piedra, Roubideau, and Tabeguache areas identified in section 9 of this Act, or the Bowen Gulch Protection Area or the Fossil Ridge Recreation Management Area identified in sections 5 and 6 of this Act”, or “the areas described in sections 2, 5, 6, and 9 of this Act” shall be considered to be a reference to “the Special Management Areas”; and

(2) any reference contained in that section to “this Act” shall be considered to be a reference to “the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act”.

SEC. 224. RELEASE OF WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.

(a) DOMINGUEZ CANYON WILDERNESS STUDY AREA.—Subtitle E of title II of Public Law 111-11 is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 2408 (16 U.S.C. 460zzz-7) as section 2409; and

(2) by inserting after section 2407 (16 U.S.C. 460zzz-6) the following:

“SEC. 2408. RELEASE.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Congress finds that, for the purposes of section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)), the portions of the Dominguez Canyon Wilderness Study Area not designated as wilderness by this subtitle have been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

“(b) RELEASE.—Any public land referred to in subsection (a) that is not designated as wilderness by this subtitle—

“(1) is no longer subject to section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)); and

“(2) shall be managed in accordance with this subtitle and any other applicable laws.”.

(b) MCKENNA PEAK WILDERNESS STUDY AREA.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Congress finds that, for the purposes of section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)), the portions of the McKenna Peak Wilderness Study Area in San Miguel County in the State not designated as wilderness by paragraph (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) (as added by section 222) have been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

(2) RELEASE.—Any public land referred to in paragraph (1) that is not designated as wilderness by paragraph (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) (as added by section 222)—

(A) is no longer subject to section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)); and

(B) shall be managed in accordance with applicable laws.

SEC. 225. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—Nothing in this subtitle affects the jurisdiction or responsibility of the State with respect to fish and wildlife in the State.

(b) NO BUFFER ZONES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this subtitle establishes a protective perimeter or buffer zone around covered land.

(2) ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE WILDERNESS.—The fact that a nonwilderness activity or use on land outside of the covered land can be seen or heard from within covered land shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the covered land.

(c) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, shall file a map and a legal description of each wilderness area designated by paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) (as added by section 222) and the Special Management Areas with—

(A) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this subtitle, except that the Secretary or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, may correct any typographical errors in the maps and legal descriptions.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service.

(d) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, may acquire any land or interest in land within the boundaries of a Special Management Area or the wilderness designated under paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) (as added by section 222) only through exchange, donation, or purchase from a willing seller.

(2) MANAGEMENT.—Any land or interest in land acquired under paragraph (1) shall be incorporated into, and administered as a part of, the wilderness or Special Management Area in which the land or interest in land is located.

(e) GRAZING.—The grazing of livestock on covered land, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are considered to be necessary by the Secretary with jurisdiction over the covered land, in accordance with—

(1) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(2) the applicable guidelines set forth in Appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (H. Rept. 101-405) or H.R. 5487 of the 96th Congress (H. Rept. 96-617).

(f) FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary with jurisdiction over a wilderness area designated by paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) (as added by section 222) may carry out any activity in the wilderness area that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(g) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, the covered land and the approximately 6,590 acres generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Naturita Canyon Mineral Withdrawal Area” and dated September 6, 2018, is withdrawn from—

(1) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

Subtitle C—Thompson Divide

SEC. 231. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this subtitle are—

(1) subject to valid existing rights, to withdraw certain Federal land in the Thompson Divide area from mineral and other disposal laws; and

(2) to promote the capture of fugitive methane emissions that would otherwise be emitted into the atmosphere—

(A) to reduce methane gas emissions; and

(B) to provide—

(i) new renewable electricity supplies and other beneficial uses of fugitive methane emissions; and

(ii) increased royalties for taxpayers.

SEC. 232. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSIONS.—The term “fugitive methane emissions” means methane gas from the Federal land in Garfield, Gunnison, Delta, or Pitkin County in the State, as generally depicted on the pilot program map as “Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program Area”, that would leak or be vented into the atmosphere from an active, inactive, or abandoned underground coal mine.

(2) PILOT PROGRAM.—The term “pilot program” means the Greater Thompson Divide Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program established by section 235(a)(1).

(3) PILOT PROGRAM MAP.—The term “pilot program map” means the map entitled “Greater Thompson Divide Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program Area” and dated June 17, 2019.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) THOMPSON DIVIDE LEASE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “Thompson Divide lease” means any oil or gas lease in effect on the date of enactment of this Act within the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term “Thompson Divide lease” does not include any oil or gas lease that—

(i) is associated with a Wolf Creek Storage Field development right; or

(ii) before the date of enactment of this Act, has expired, been cancelled, or otherwise terminated.

(6) THOMPSON DIVIDE MAP.—The term “Thompson Divide map” means the map entitled “Greater Thompson Divide Area Map” and dated June 13, 2019.

(7) THOMPSON DIVIDE WITHDRAWAL AND PROTECTION AREA.—The term “Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area” means the Federal land and minerals generally depicted on the Thompson Divide map as the “Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area”.

(8) WOLF CREEK STORAGE FIELD DEVELOPMENT RIGHT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “Wolf Creek Storage Field development right” means a development right for any of the Federal mineral leases numbered COC 007496, COC 007497, COC 007498, COC 007499, COC 007500, COC 007538, COC 008128, COC 015373, COC 0128018, COC 051645, and COC 051646, as generally depicted on the Thompson Divide map as “Wolf Creek Storage Agreement”.

(B) EXCLUSIONS.—The term “Wolf Creek Storage Field development right” does not include any storage right or related activity within the area described in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 233. THOMPSON DIVIDE WITHDRAWAL AND PROTECTION AREA.

(a) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area is withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(b) **SURVEYS.**—The exact acreage and legal description of the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area shall be determined by surveys approved by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture.

(c) **GRAZING.**—The grazing of livestock on covered land, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be allowed to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are considered to be necessary by the Secretary with jurisdiction over the covered land.

SEC. 234. THOMPSON DIVIDE LEASE EXCHANGE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In exchange for the relinquishment by a leaseholder of all Thompson Divide leases of the leaseholder, the Secretary may issue to the leaseholder credits for any bid, royalty, or rental payment due under any Federal oil or gas lease on Federal land in the State, in accordance with subsection (b).

(b) **AMOUNT OF CREDITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the amount of the credits issued to a leaseholder of a Thompson Divide lease relinquished under subsection (a) shall—

(A) be equal to the sum of—

(i) the amount of the bonus bids paid for the applicable Thompson Divide leases;

(ii) the amount of any rental paid for the applicable Thompson Divide leases as of the date on which the leaseholder submits to the Secretary a notice of the decision to relinquish the applicable Thompson Divide leases; and

(iii) the amount of any expenses incurred by the leaseholder of the applicable Thompson Divide leases in the preparation of any drilling permit, sundry notice, or other related submission in support of the development of the applicable Thompson Divide leases as of January 28, 2019, including any expenses relating to the preparation of any analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(B) require the approval of the Secretary.

(2) **EXCLUSION.**—The amount of a credit issued under subsection (a) shall not include any expenses paid by the leaseholder of a Thompson Divide lease for legal fees or related expenses for legal work with respect to a Thompson Divide lease.

(c) **CANCELLATION.**—Effective on relinquishment under this section, and without any additional action by the Secretary, a Thompson Divide lease—

(1) shall be permanently cancelled; and

(2) shall not be reissued.

(d) **CONDITIONS.**—

(1) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Except as otherwise provided in this section, each exchange under this section shall be conducted in accordance with—

(A) this title; and

(B) other applicable laws (including regulations).

(2) **ACCEPTANCE OF CREDITS.**—The Secretary shall accept credits issued under subsection (a) in the same manner as cash for the payments described in that subsection.

(3) **APPLICABILITY.**—The use of a credit issued under subsection (a) shall be subject to the laws (including regulations) applicable to the payments described in that subsection, to the extent that the laws are consistent with this section.

(4) **TREATMENT OF CREDITS.**—All amounts in the form of credits issued under subsection (a) accepted by the Secretary shall be considered to be amounts received for the purposes of—

(A) section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191); and

(B) section 20 of the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1019).

(e) **WOLF CREEK STORAGE FIELD DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS.**—

(1) **CONVEYANCE TO SECRETARY.**—As a condition precedent to the relinquishment of a Thompson Divide lease, any leaseholder with a Wolf Creek Storage Field development right shall permanently relinquish, transfer, and otherwise convey to the Secretary, in a form acceptable to the Secretary, all Wolf Creek Storage Field development rights of the leaseholder.

(2) **LIMITATION OF TRANSFER.**—An interest acquired by the Secretary under paragraph (1)—

(A) shall be held in perpetuity; and

(B) shall not be—

(i) transferred; or

(ii) reissued; or

(iii) otherwise used for mineral extraction.

SEC. 235. GREATER THOMPSON DIVIDE FUGITIVE COAL MINE METHANE USE PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **FUGITIVE COAL MINE METHANE USE PILOT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the Bureau of Land Management a pilot program, to be known as the “Greater Thompson Divide Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program”.

(2) **PURPOSE.**—The purpose of the pilot program is to promote the capture, beneficial use, mitigation, and sequestration of fugitive methane emissions—

(A) to reduce methane emissions;

(B) to promote economic development;

(C) to produce bid and royalty revenues;

(D) to improve air quality; and

(E) to improve public safety.

(3) **PLAN.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a plan—

(i) to complete an inventory of fugitive methane emissions in accordance with subsection (b);

(ii) to provide for the leasing of fugitive methane emissions in accordance with subsection (c); and

(iii) to provide for the capping or destruction of fugitive methane emissions in accordance with subsection (d).

(B) **COORDINATION.**—In developing the plan under this paragraph, the Secretary shall coordinate with—

(i) the State;

(ii) Garfield, Gunnison, Delta, and Pitkin Counties in the State;

(iii) lessees of Federal coal within the counties referred to in clause (ii);

(iv) interested institutions of higher education in the State; and

(v) interested members of the public.

(b) **FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSION INVENTORY.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete an inventory of fugitive methane emissions.

(2) **CONDUCT.**—The Secretary may conduct the inventory under paragraph (1) through, or in collaboration with—

(A) the Bureau of Land Management;

(B) the United States Geological Survey;

(C) the Environmental Protection Agency;

(D) the United States Forest Service;

(E) State departments or agencies;

(F) Garfield, Gunnison, Delta, or Pitkin County in the State;

(G) the Garfield County Federal Mineral Lease District;

(H) institutions of higher education in the State;

(I) lessees of Federal coal within a county referred to in subparagraph (F);

(J) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;

(K) the National Center for Atmospheric Research; or

(L) other interested entities, including members of the public.

(3) **CONTENTS.**—The inventory under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) the general location and geographic coordinates of each vent, seep, or other source producing significant fugitive methane emissions;

(B) an estimate of the volume and concentration of fugitive methane emissions from each source of significant fugitive methane emissions, including details of measurements taken and the basis for that emissions estimate;

(C) an estimate of the total volume of fugitive methane emissions each year;

(D) relevant data and other information available from—

(i) the Environmental Protection Agency;

(ii) the Mine Safety and Health Administration;

(iii) the department of natural resources of the State;

(iv) the Colorado Public Utility Commission;

(v) the department of health and environment of the State; and

(vi) the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement; and

(E) such other information as may be useful in advancing the purposes of the pilot program.

(4) **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION; DISCLOSURE.**—

(A) **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.**—The Secretary shall provide opportunities for public participation in the inventory under this subsection.

(B) **AVAILABILITY.**—The Secretary shall make the inventory under this subsection publicly available.

(C) **DISCLOSURE.**—Nothing in this subsection requires the Secretary to publicly release information that—

(i) poses a threat to public safety;

(ii) is confidential business information; or

(iii) is otherwise protected from public disclosure.

(5) **USE.**—The Secretary shall use the inventory in carrying out—

(A) the leasing program under subsection (c); and

(B) the capping or destruction of fugitive methane emissions under subsection (d).

(c) **FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSION LEASING PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights and in accordance with this section, not later than 1 year after the date of completion of the inventory required under subsection (b), the Secretary shall carry out a program to encourage the use and destruction of fugitive methane emissions.

(2) **FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSIONS FROM COAL MINES SUBJECT TO LEASE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall authorize the holder of a valid existing Federal coal lease for a mine that is producing fugitive methane emissions to capture for use, or destroy by flaring, the fugitive methane emissions.

(B) **CONDITIONS.**—The authority under subparagraph (A) shall be subject to—

(i) valid existing rights; and

(ii) such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(C) **LIMITATIONS.**—The program carried out under subparagraph (A) shall only include fugitive methane emissions that can be captured for use, or destroyed by flaring, in a manner that does not—

(i) endanger the safety of any coal mine worker; or

(ii) unreasonably interfere with any ongoing operation at a coal mine.

(D) **COOPERATION.**—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall work cooperatively with the holders of valid existing Federal coal leases for mines that produce fugitive methane emissions to encourage—

(I) the capture of fugitive methane emissions for beneficial use, such as generating electrical power, producing usable heat, transporting the methane to market, or transforming the fugitive methane emissions into a different marketable material; or

(II) if the beneficial use of the fugitive methane emissions is not feasible, the destruction of the fugitive methane emissions by flaring.

(ii) GUIDANCE.—In furtherance of the purposes of this paragraph, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue guidance for the implementation of Federal authorities and programs to encourage the capture for use, or destruction by flaring, of fugitive methane emissions, while minimizing impacts on natural resources or other public interest values.

(E) ROYALTIES.—The Secretary shall determine whether any fugitive methane emissions used or destroyed pursuant to this paragraph are subject to the payment of a royalty under applicable law.

(3) FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSIONS FROM ABANDONED COAL MINES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, notwithstanding section 233, subject to valid existing rights, and in accordance with section 21 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 241) and any other applicable law, the Secretary shall—

(i) authorize the capture for use, or destruction by flaring, of fugitive methane emissions from abandoned coal mines on Federal land; and

(ii) make available for leasing such fugitive methane emissions from abandoned coal mines on Federal land as the Secretary considers to be in the public interest.

(B) SOURCE.—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall offer for lease each significant vent, seep, or other source of fugitive methane emissions from abandoned coal mines.

(C) BID QUALIFICATIONS.—A bid to lease fugitive methane emissions under this paragraph shall specify whether the prospective lessee intends—

(i) to capture the fugitive methane emissions for beneficial use, such as generating electrical power, producing usable heat, transporting the methane to market, or transforming the fugitive methane emissions into a different marketable material;

(ii) to destroy the fugitive methane emissions by flaring; or

(iii) to employ a specific combination of—

(I) capturing the fugitive methane emissions for beneficial use; and

(II) destroying the fugitive methane emissions by flaring.

(D) PRIORITY.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—In any case in which 2 or more qualified bids are submitted for a lease under this paragraph, the Secretary shall select the bid that the Secretary determines is likely to most significantly advance the public interest.

(ii) CONSIDERATIONS.—In determining the public interest under clause (i), the Secretary shall take into consideration—

(I) the size of the overall decrease in the time-integrated radiative forcing of the fugitive methane emissions;

(II) the impacts to other natural resource values, including wildlife, water, and air; and

(III) other public interest values, including scenic, economic, recreation, and cultural values.

(E) LEASE FORM.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall develop and provide to prospective bidders a lease form for leases issued under this paragraph.

(ii) DUE DILIGENCE.—The lease form developed under clause (i) shall include terms and conditions requiring the leased fugitive methane emissions to be put to beneficial use or flared by not later than 1 year after the date of issuance of the lease.

(F) ROYALTY RATE.—The Secretary shall develop a minimum bid and royalty rate for leases under this paragraph to advance the purposes of this section, to the maximum extent practicable.

(d) SEQUESTRATION.—If, by not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, any significant fugitive methane emissions from abandoned coal mines on Federal land are not leased under subsection (c)(3), the Secretary shall, in accordance with applicable law, take all reasonable measures—

(1) to cap those fugitive methane emissions at the source in any case in which the cap will result in the long-term sequestration of all or a significant portion of the fugitive methane emissions; or

(2) if sequestration under paragraph (1) is not feasible, destroy the fugitive methane emissions by flaring.

(e) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives a report detailing—

(1) the economic and environmental impacts of the pilot program, including information on increased royalties and estimates of avoided greenhouse gas emissions; and

(2) any recommendations of the Secretary regarding whether the pilot program could be expanded geographically to include other significant sources of fugitive methane emissions from coal mines.

SEC. 236. EFFECT.

Except as expressly provided in this subtitle, nothing in this subtitle—

(1) expands, diminishes, or impairs any valid existing mineral leases, mineral interest, or other property rights wholly or partially within the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area, including access to the leases, interests, rights, or land in accordance with applicable Federal, State, and local laws (including regulations);

(2) prevents the capture of methane from any active, inactive, or abandoned coal mine covered by this subtitle, in accordance with applicable laws; or

(3) prevents access to, or the development of, any new or existing coal mine or lease in Delta or Gunnison County in the State.

Subtitle D—Curecanti National Recreation Area

SEC. 241. DEFINITIONS.

In this subtitle:

(1) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Curecanti National Recreation Area, Proposed Boundary”, numbered 616/100,485C, and dated August 11, 2016.

(2) NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.—The term “National Recreation Area” means the Curecanti National Recreation Area established by section 242(a).

(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 242. CURECANTI NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Effective beginning on the earlier of the date on which the Secretary approves a request under subsection (c)(2)(B)(i)(I) and the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, there shall be established as a unit of the National Park System the Curecanti National Recreation

Area, in accordance with this title, consisting of approximately 50,667 acres of land in the State, as generally depicted on the map as “Curecanti National Recreation Area Proposed Boundary”.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(c) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the National Recreation Area in accordance with—

(A) this subtitle; and

(B) the laws (including regulations) generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including section 100101(a), chapter 1003, and sections 100751(a), 100752, 100753, and 102101 of title 54, United States Code.

(2) DAM, POWER PLANT, AND RESERVOIR MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this subtitle affects or interferes with the authority of the Secretary—

(i) to operate the Uncompahgre Valley Reclamation Project under the reclamation laws;

(ii) to operate the Wayne N. Aspinall Unit of the Colorado River Storage Project under the Act of April 11, 1956 (commonly known as the “Colorado River Storage Project Act”) (43 U.S.C. 620 et seq.); or

(iii) under the Federal Water Project Reclamation Act (16 U.S.C. 4601–12 et seq.).

(B) RECLAMATION LAND.—

(i) SUBMISSION OF REQUEST TO RETAIN ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—If, before the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Reclamation submits to the Secretary a request for the Commissioner of Reclamation to retain administrative jurisdiction over the minimum quantity of land within the land identified on the map as “Lands withdrawn or acquired for Bureau of Reclamation projects” that the Commissioner of Reclamation identifies as necessary for the effective operation of Bureau of Reclamation water facilities, the Secretary may—

(I) approve, approve with modifications, or disapprove the request; and

(II) if the request is approved under subclause (I), make any modifications to the map that are necessary to reflect that the Commissioner of Reclamation retains management authority over the minimum quantity of land required to fulfill the reclamation mission.

(ii) TRANSFER OF LAND.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—Administrative jurisdiction over the land identified on the map as “Lands withdrawn or acquired for Bureau of Reclamation projects”, as modified pursuant to clause (i)(II), if applicable, shall be transferred from the Commissioner of Reclamation to the Director of the National Park Service by not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(II) ACCESS TO TRANSFERRED LAND.—

(aa) IN GENERAL.—Subject to item (bb), the Commissioner of Reclamation shall retain access to the land transferred to the Director of the National Park Service under subclause (I) for reclamation purposes, including for the operation, maintenance, and expansion or replacement of facilities.

(bb) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The terms of the access authorized under item (aa) shall be determined by a memorandum of understanding entered into between the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Director of the National Park Service not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into management agreements, or modify

management agreements in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, relating to the authority of the Director of the National Park Service, the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, or the Chief of the Forest Service to manage Federal land within or adjacent to the boundary of the National Recreation Area.

(B) **STATE LAND.**—The Secretary may enter into cooperative management agreements for any land administered by the State that is within or adjacent to the National Recreation Area, in accordance with the cooperative management authority under section 101703 of title 54, United States Code.

(4) **RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES.**—

(A) **AUTHORIZATION.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall allow boating, boating-related activities, hunting, and fishing in the National Recreation Area in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws.

(B) **CLOSURES; DESIGNATED ZONES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary, acting through the Superintendent of the National Recreation Area, may designate zones in which, and establish periods during which, no boating, hunting, or fishing shall be permitted in the National Recreation Area under subparagraph (A) for reasons of public safety, administration, or compliance with applicable laws.

(ii) **CONSULTATION REQUIRED.**—Except in the case of an emergency, any closure proposed by the Secretary under clause (i) shall not take effect until after the date on which the Superintendent of the National Recreation Area consults with—

(I) the appropriate State agency responsible for hunting and fishing activities; and

(II) the Board of County Commissioners in each county in which the zone is proposed to be designated.

(5) **LANDOWNER ASSISTANCE.**—On the written request of an individual that owns private land located not more than 3 miles from the boundary of the National Recreation Area, the Secretary may work in partnership with the individual to enhance the long-term conservation of natural, cultural, recreational, and scenic resources in and around the National Recreation Area—

(A) by acquiring all or a portion of the private land or interests in private land located not more than 3 miles from the boundary of the National Recreation Area by purchase, exchange, or donation, in accordance with section 243;

(B) by providing technical assistance to the individual, including cooperative assistance;

(C) through available grant programs; and

(D) by supporting conservation easement opportunities.

(6) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, all Federal land within the National Recreation Area is withdrawn from—

(A) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(C) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(7) **GRAZING.**—

(A) **STATE LAND SUBJECT TO STATE GRAZING LEASE.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If State land acquired under this subtitle is subject to a State grazing lease in effect on the date of acquisition, the Secretary shall allow the grazing to continue for the remainder of the term of the lease, subject to the related terms and conditions of user agreements, including permitted stocking rates, grazing fee levels, access rights, and ownership and use of range improvements.

(ii) **ACCESS.**—A lessee of State land may continue use of established routes within the National Recreation Area to access State land for purposes of administering the lease if the use was permitted before the date of enactment of this Act, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(B) **STATE AND PRIVATE LAND.**—The Secretary may, in accordance with applicable laws, authorize grazing on land acquired from the State or private landowners under section 243, if grazing was established before the date of acquisition.

(C) **PRIVATE LAND.**—On private land acquired under section 243 for the National Recreation Area on which authorized grazing is occurring before the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the lessee, may allow the continuation and renewal of grazing on the land based on the terms of acquisition or by agreement between the Secretary and the lessee, subject to applicable law (including regulations).

(D) **FEDERAL LAND.**—The Secretary shall—

(i) allow, consistent with the grazing leases, uses, and practices in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act, the continuation and renewal of grazing on Federal land located within the boundary of the National Recreation Area on which grazing is allowed before the date of enactment of this Act, unless the Secretary determines that grazing on the Federal land would present unacceptable impacts (as defined in section 1.4.7.1 of the National Park Service document entitled “Management Policies 2006: The Guide to Managing the National Park System”) to the natural, cultural, recreational, and scenic resource values and the character of the land within the National Recreation Area; and

(ii) retain all authorities to manage grazing in the National Recreation Area.

(E) **TERMINATION OF LEASES.**—Within the National Recreation Area, the Secretary may—

(i) accept the voluntary termination of a lease or permit for grazing; or

(ii) in the case of a lease or permit vacated for a period of 3 or more years, terminate the lease or permit.

(8) **WATER RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this subtitle—

(A) affects any use or allocation in existence on the date of enactment of this Act of any water, water right, or interest in water;

(B) affects any vested absolute or decreed conditional water right in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, including any water right held by the United States;

(C) affects any interstate water compact in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(D) authorizes or imposes any new reserved Federal water right;

(E) shall be considered to be a relinquishment or reduction of any water right reserved or appropriated by the United States in the State on or before the date of enactment of this Act; or

(F) constitutes an express or implied reservation by the United States of any water or water right with respect to the National Recreation Area.

(9) **FISHING EASEMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Nothing in this subtitle diminishes or alters the fish and wildlife program for the Aspinall Unit developed under section 8 of the Act of April 11, 1956 (commonly known as the “Colorado River Storage Project Act”) (70 Stat. 110, chapter 203; 43 U.S.C. 620g), by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Colorado Division of Wildlife (including any successor in interest to that division) that provides for the acquisition of public access fishing easements as mitiga-

tion for the Aspinall Unit (referred to in this paragraph as the “program”).

(B) **ACQUISITION OF FISHING EASEMENTS.**—The Secretary shall continue to fulfill the obligation of the Secretary under the program to acquire 26 miles of class 1 public fishing easements to provide to sportsmen access for fishing within the Upper Gunnison Basin upstream of the Aspinall Unit, subject to the condition that no existing fishing access downstream of the Aspinall Unit shall be counted toward the minimum mileage requirement under the program.

(C) **PLAN.**—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(i) develop a plan for fulfilling the obligation of the Secretary described in subparagraph (B); and

(ii) submit to Congress a report that—

(I) includes the plan developed under clause (i); and

(II) describes any progress made in the acquisition of public access fishing easements as mitigation for the Aspinall Unit under the program.

SEC. 243. ACQUISITION OF LAND; BOUNDARY MANAGEMENT.

(a) **ACQUISITION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary may acquire any land or interest in land within the boundary of the National Recreation Area.

(2) **MANNER OF ACQUISITION.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to subparagraph (B), land described in paragraph (1) may be acquired under this subsection by—

(i) donation;

(ii) purchase from willing sellers with donated or appropriated funds;

(iii) transfer from another Federal agency; or

(iv) exchange.

(B) **STATE LAND.**—Land or interests in land owned by the State or a political subdivision of the State may only be acquired by purchase, donation, or exchange.

(b) **TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.**—

(1) **FOREST SERVICE LAND.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 2,560 acres of land identified on the map as “U.S. Forest Service proposed transfer to the National Park Service” is transferred to the Secretary, to be administered by the Director of the National Park Service as part of the National Recreation Area.

(B) **BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.**—The boundary of the Gunnison National Forest shall be adjusted to exclude the land transferred to the Secretary under subparagraph (A).

(2) **BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT LAND.**—Administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 5,040 acres of land identified on the map as “Bureau of Land Management proposed transfer to National Park Service” is transferred from the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to the Director of the National Park Service, to be administered as part of the National Recreation Area.

(3) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Administrative jurisdiction over the land identified on the map as “Proposed for transfer to the Bureau of Land Management, subject to the revocation of Bureau of Reclamation withdrawal” shall be transferred to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management on relinquishment of the land by the Bureau of Reclamation and revocation by the Bureau of Land Management of any withdrawal as may be necessary.

(c) **POTENTIAL LAND EXCHANGE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The withdrawal for reclamation purposes of the land identified on the map as “Potential exchange lands” shall be relinquished by the Commissioner of Reclamation and revoked by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management and the land

shall be transferred to the National Park Service.

(2) EXCHANGE; INCLUSION IN NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.—On transfer of the land described in paragraph (1), the transferred land—

(A) may be exchanged by the Secretary for private land described in section 242(c)(5)—

(i) subject to a conservation easement remaining on the transferred land, to protect the scenic resources of the transferred land; and

(ii) in accordance with the laws (including regulations) and policies governing National Park Service land exchanges; and

(B) if not exchanged under subparagraph (A), shall be added to, and managed as a part of, the National Recreation Area.

(d) ADDITION TO NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.—Any land within the boundary of the National Recreation Area that is acquired by the United States shall be added to, and managed as a part of, the National Recreation Area.

SEC. 244. GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.

Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this subtitle, the Director of the National Park Service, in consultation with the Commissioner of Reclamation, shall prepare a general management plan for the National Recreation Area in accordance with section 100502 of title 54, United States Code.

SEC. 245. BOUNDARY SURVEY.

The Secretary (acting through the Director of the National Park Service) shall prepare a boundary survey and legal description of the National Recreation Area.

SA 1608. Ms. MCSALLY (for herself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mrs. FISCHER, Mr. RISCH, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . AGING INFRASTRUCTURE ACCOUNT.

Section 9603 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 510b) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(d) AGING INFRASTRUCTURE ACCOUNT.—

“(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the general fund of the Treasury a special account, to be known as the ‘Aging Infrastructure Account’ (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Account’), to provide funds to, and provide for the extended repayment of the funds by, a transferred works operating entity or project beneficiary responsible for repayment of reimbursable costs for the conduct of extraordinary operation and maintenance work at a project facility, which shall consist of—

“(A) any amounts that are specifically appropriated to the Account under section 9605;

“(B) for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, subject to the availability of funds, \$400,000,000 of the revenues that would otherwise be deposited for the fiscal year in the reclamation fund established by the first section of the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388, chapter 1093) (other than the revenues from timber sales under that section or revenues deposited under section 35(a) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191(a))); and

“(C) any amounts deposited in the Account under paragraph (3)(B).

“(2) EXPENDITURES.—Subject to paragraph (3), the Secretary may expend amounts in the Account to fund and provide for extended repayment of the funds—

“(A) for each of fiscal years 2020 and 2021, for projects that are identified by the Secretary as major repair and replacement projects for which construction or associated preconstruction field work is capable of being initiated during fiscal year 2020 or 2021, as applicable; and

“(B) for fiscal year 2022 and each fiscal year thereafter, for eligible projects identified in a report submitted under paragraph (5)(A).

“(3) REPAYMENT CONTRACT.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may not expend amounts under paragraph (2) with respect to an eligible project described in that paragraph unless the transferred works operating entity or project beneficiary responsible for repayment of reimbursable costs has entered into a contract to repay the amounts under subsection (b)(2).

“(B) DEPOSIT OF REPAID FUNDS.—Amounts repaid by a transferred works operating entity or project beneficiary responsible for repayment of reimbursable costs receiving funds under a repayment contract entered into under this subsection shall be deposited in the Account and shall be available to the Secretary for expenditure in accordance with this subsection without further appropriation.

“(4) APPLICATION FOR FUNDING.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Beginning with fiscal year 2022, not less than once per fiscal year, the Secretary shall accept, during an application period established by the Secretary, applications from transferred works operating entities or project beneficiaries responsible for payment of reimbursable costs for funds and extended repayment for eligible projects.

“(B) ELIGIBLE PROJECT.—A project eligible for funding and extended repayment under this subsection is a project that—

“(i) qualifies as an extraordinary operation and maintenance work under this section;

“(ii) is for the major, non-recurring maintenance of a mission-critical asset; and

“(iii) is not eligible to be carried out or funded under the repayment provisions of section 4(c) of the Reclamation Safety of Dams Act of 1978 (43 U.S.C. 508(c)).

“(C) GUIDELINES FOR APPLICATIONS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Secretary shall issue guidelines describing the information required to be provided in an application for funds and extended repayment under this subsection that require, at a minimum—

“(i) a description of the project for which the funds are requested;

“(ii) the amount of funds requested;

“(iii) the repayment period requested by the transferred works operating entity or project beneficiary responsible for repayment of reimbursable costs;

“(iv) alternative non-Federal funding options that have been evaluated;

“(v) the financial justification for requesting an extended repayment period; and

“(vi) the financial records of the transferred works operating entity or project beneficiary responsible for repayment of reimbursable costs.

“(D) REVIEW BY THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall review each application submitted under subparagraph (A)—

“(i) to determine whether the project is eligible for funds and an extended repayment period under this subsection;

“(ii) to determine if the project has been identified by the Bureau of Reclamation as part of the major rehabilitation and replacement of a project facility; and

“(iii) to conduct a financial analysis of—

“(I) the project; and

“(II) the transferred works operating entity or project beneficiary responsible for repayment of reimbursable costs.

“(5) REPORT.—Not later than 90 days after the date on which an application period closes under paragraph (4)(A), the Secretary shall submit to the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources and Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Natural Resources and Appropriations of the House of Representatives a report that—

“(A) identifies each project eligible for funds and extended repayment under this subsection;

“(B) with respect to each eligible project identified under subparagraph (A), includes—

“(i) a description of—

“(I) the eligible project;

“(II) the anticipated cost and duration of the eligible project; and

“(III) any remaining engineering or environmental compliance that is required before the eligible project commences;

“(ii) an analysis of—

“(I) the repayment period proposed in the application; and

“(II) if the Secretary recommends a minimum necessary repayment period that is different than the repayment period proposed in the application, the minimum necessary repayment period recommended by the Secretary; and

“(iii) an analysis of alternative non-Federal funding options; and

“(C) describes the balance of funds in the Account as of the date of the report.

“(6) EFFECT OF SUBSECTION.—Nothing in this subsection affects—

“(A) any funding provided, or contracts entered into, under subsection (a) before the date of enactment of this subsection; or

“(B) the use of funds otherwise made available to the Secretary to carry out subsection (a).”.

SA 1609. Mrs. BLACKBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . HERMITAGE HOTEL NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDMARK.

The Hermitage Hotel, as listed on the National Register of Historic Places, is designated as the “Hermitage Hotel National Historic Landmark”.

SA 1610. Mrs. BLACKBURN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . JAMES K. POLK HOME NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) HISTORIC SITE.—The term “Historic Site” means the James K. Polk Home National Historic Site designated by the Secretary under subsection (b).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service.

(b) ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY; DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.—If the Secretary of the Interior acquires the James K. Polk Home and Museum located at 301 West 7th Street, Columbia, Tennessee, the Secretary of the Interior shall designate the James K. Polk Home and Museum as—

(1) a National Historic Site, to be known as the “James K. Polk Home National Historic Site”; and

(2) a unit of the National Park System.

(c) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—The Secretary shall administer the Historic Site in accordance with the laws (including regulations) generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including—

(1) section 100101(a), chapter 1003, and sections 100751(a), 100752, 100753, and 102101 of title 54, United States Code; and

(2) chapter 3201 of title 54, United States Code.

SA 1611. Mr. ROUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ . ACQUISITION OF EASEMENTS USING AMOUNTS FROM THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

Section 200306 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **ACQUISITION OF EASEMENTS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In acquiring easements under subsection (a)(2)(C), the Secretary (acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service) (referred to in this subsection as the ‘Secretary’) shall make available the option of a 30-year easement as an alternative to a permanent easement in any case in which a permanent easement is being considered.

“(2) **COMPENSATION.**—The Secretary shall establish the amount of compensation for a 30-year easement made available under paragraph (1) at a rate that encourages the use of 30-year easements as an alternative to permanent easements under subsection (a)(2)(C).”.

SA 1612. Mrs. HYDE-SMITH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the appropriate place, insert the following:

SEC. ____ . GULF OF MEXICO OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.

(a) **DEFINITION OF QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.**—Section 102(9)(A) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432) is amended—

(1) in clause (i)(II), by striking “and” after the semicolon;

(2) in clause (ii)—

(A) in the matter preceding subclause (I), by striking “fiscal year 2017 and each fiscal year thereafter” and inserting “each of fiscal years 2017 through 2019”; and

(B) in subclause (II), by striking the period and inserting “; and”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(iii) in the case of fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter, all rentals, royalties, bonus bids, and other sums due and payable to the United States received on or after October 1, 2019, from leases entered into on or after October 1, 2000 for—

“(I) the 181 Area;

“(II) the 181 South Area; and

“(III) the 2002-2007 planning area.”.

(b) **DISPOSITION OF QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 105(a) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “50” and inserting “37.5”; and

(B) in paragraph (2)—

(i) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “50” and inserting “62.5”; and

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking “75” and inserting “80”; and

(iii) in subparagraph (B), by striking “25” and inserting “20”.

(2) **LIMITATIONS ON AMOUNT OF DISTRIBUTED QUALIFIED OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF REVENUES.**—Section 105(f) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C);

(ii) in subparagraph (A), by striking the semicolon at the end and inserting a period; and

(iii) beginning in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “exceed—” and all that follows through “for each” in subparagraph (A) and inserting the following: “exceed \$500,000,000 for each”; and

(B) in paragraph (2), by striking “2055” and inserting “2019”.

(c) **EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN PAYMENTS FROM SEQUESTRATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 255(g)(1)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 905(g)(1)(A)) is amended by inserting after “Payments to Social Security Trust Funds (28-0404-0-1-651).” the following:

“Payments to States pursuant to section 105(a)(2)(A) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-432; 43 U.S.C. 1331 note) (014-5535-0-2-302).”.

(2) **APPLICABILITY.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to any sequestration order issued under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.) on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

SA 1613. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. CERTAIN LAND ACQUISITION REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

Section 200306 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) **MAINTENANCE NEEDS.**—

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Prior to acquiring land under this section, the Secretary or the Secretary of Agriculture, as applicable, shall take into account the deferred maintenance needs of the land proposed for acquisition.

“(2) **FUNDING.**—Funds appropriated for the acquisition of land under this section shall include any funds necessary to address deferred maintenance needs at the time of acquisition of the acquired land.”.

SA 1614. Mr. LANKFORD (for himself and Mr. RISCH) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end of section 3, add the following: (d) **SUNSET.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Effective on the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, subsections (a), (b), and (c) and the amendments made by those subsections are repealed.

(2) **APPLICATION.**—Effective on the date described in paragraph (1), chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, shall be applied and administered as if subsections (a), (b), and (c) and the amendments made by those subsections had not been enacted.

SA 1615. Mr. RISCH (for himself and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ . RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN LAND ACQUISITIONS USING AMOUNTS FROM THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

Section 200306(b) of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “Appropriations” and inserting the following:

“(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Appropriations”; and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “Appropriations” and inserting the following:

“(2) **PREACQUISITION.**—Appropriations”; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

“(3) **CONSENT REQUIRED FOR CERTAIN LAND ACQUISITIONS.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), appropriations from the Fund under this section may not be used for the acquisition of land, water, or an interest in land or water in a State in which greater than 27 percent of the total acreage of land in the State is Federal land.

“(B) **EXCEPTION.**—Subparagraph (A) shall not apply to a proposed acquisition of land, water, or an interest in land or water if—

“(i) the Secretary has received from the State written notice that the State has enacted legislation approving the proposed acquisition of land, water, or an interest in land or water; or

“(ii) the Secretary has received from the Governor of the State written notice that the Governor approves the proposed acquisition of land, water, or an interest in land or water.”.

SA 1616. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. 4. PRESIDIO TRUST BORROWING AUTHORITY.

Section 104(d)(2) of division I of the Omnibus Parks and Public Lands Management Act of 1996 (16 U.S.C. 460bb note; Public Law 104-333) is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: “The Trust shall have the authority to issue obligations to the Secretary of the Treasury. The Secretary of the Treasury shall purchase the obligations issued by the Trust under this paragraph.”.

SA 1617. Mr. GARDNER (for himself, Mr. MANCHIN, Mr. DAINES, Mr. WARNER, Mr. PORTMAN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr.

ALEXANDER, Mr. KING, Mr. BURR, Mr. TESTER, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. UDALL, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. HARRIS, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. TILLIS, Ms. BALDWIN, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. CASEY, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HEINRICH, Mr. BENNET, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KAINE, Ms. SINEMA, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. COONS, Ms. SMITH, Ms. HASSAN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. SHAHEEN, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. JONES, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BROWN, Ms. HIRONO, Ms. WARREN, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PERDUE, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. SCHATZ) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Great American Outdoors Act”.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL PARKS AND PUBLIC LAND LEGACY RESTORATION FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subtitle II of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after chapter 2003 the following:

“CHAPTER 2004—NATIONAL PARKS AND PUBLIC LAND LEGACY RESTORATION FUND

“Sec.

“200401. Definitions.

“200402. National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund.

“§ 200401. Definitions

“In this chapter:

“(1) ASSET.—The term ‘asset’ means any real property, including any physical structure or grouping of structures, landscape, trail, or other tangible property, that—

“(A) has a specific service or function; and

“(B) is tracked and managed as a distinct, identifiable entity by the applicable covered agency.

“(2) COVERED AGENCY.—The term ‘covered agency’ means—

“(A) the Service;

“(B) the United States Fish and Wildlife Service;

“(C) the Forest Service;

“(D) the Bureau of Land Management; and

“(E) the Bureau of Indian Education.

“(3) FUND.—The term ‘Fund’ means the National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund established by section 200402(a).

“(4) PROJECT.—The term ‘project’ means any activity to reduce or eliminate deferred maintenance of an asset, which may include resolving directly related infrastructure deficiencies of the asset that would not by itself be classified as deferred maintenance.

“§ 200402. National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund

“(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a fund to be known as the ‘National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund’.

“(b) DEPOSITS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), for each of fiscal years 2021 through 2025, there shall be deposited in the

Fund an amount equal to 50 percent of all energy development revenues due and payable to the United States from oil, gas, coal, or alternative or renewable energy development on Federal land and water credited, covered, or deposited as miscellaneous receipts under Federal law in the preceding fiscal year.

“(2) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—The amount deposited in the Fund under paragraph (1) shall not exceed \$1,900,000,000 for any fiscal year.

“(3) EFFECT ON OTHER REVENUES.—Nothing in this section affects the disposition of revenues that—

“(A) are due to the United States, special funds, trust funds, or States from mineral and energy development on Federal land and water; or

“(B) have been otherwise appropriated—

“(i) under Federal law, including—

“(I) the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432); and

“(II) the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.); or

“(ii) from—

“(I) the Land and Water Conservation Fund established under chapter 2003; or

“(II) the Historic Preservation Fund established under chapter 3031.

“(c) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts deposited in the Fund shall be available to the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture, as provided in subsection (e), without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation.

“(d) INVESTMENT OF AMOUNTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may request the Secretary of the Treasury to invest any portion of the Fund that is not, as determined by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, required to meet the current needs of the Fund.

“(2) REQUIREMENT.—An investment requested under paragraph (1) shall be made by the Secretary of the Treasury in a public debt security—

“(A) with a maturity suitable to the needs of the Fund, as determined by the Secretary; and

“(B) bearing interest at a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration current market yields on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States of comparable maturity.

“(3) CREDITS TO FUND.—The income on investments of the Fund under this subsection shall be credited to, and form a part of, the Fund.

“(e) USE OF FUNDS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be used for priority deferred maintenance projects in the System, in the National Wildlife Refuge System, on public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management, for the Bureau of Indian Education schools, and in the National Forest System, as follows:

“(A) 70 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Service.

“(B) 15 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Forest Service.

“(C) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service.

“(D) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Bureau of Land Management.

“(E) 5 percent of the amounts deposited in the Fund for each fiscal year shall be allocated to the Bureau of Indian Education.

“(2) LIMITATIONS.—

“(A) NON-TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—Over the term of the Fund, within each covered agency, not less than 65 percent of amounts

from the Fund shall be allocated for non-transportation projects.

“(B) TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.—The amounts remaining in the Fund after the allocations required under subparagraph (A) may be allocated for transportation projects of the covered agencies, including paved and unpaved roads, bridges, tunnels, and paved parking areas.

“(C) PLAN.—Any priority deferred maintenance project funded under this section shall be consistent with an applicable transportation, deferred maintenance, or capital improvement plan developed by the applicable covered agency.

“(f) PROHIBITED USE OF FUNDS.—No amounts in the Fund shall be used—

“(1) for land acquisition;

“(2) to supplant discretionary funding made available for annually recurring facility operations, maintenance, and construction needs; or

“(3) for bonuses for employees of the Federal Government that are carrying out this section.

“(g) SUBMISSION OF PRIORITY LIST OF PROJECTS TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to the Committees on Energy and Natural Resources and Appropriations of the Senate and the Committees on Natural Resources and Appropriations of the House of Representatives a list of projects to be funded for fiscal year 2021 that—

“(1) are identified by the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture as priority deferred maintenance projects; and

“(2) as of the date of the submission of the list, are ready to be implemented.

“(h) SUBMISSION OF ANNUAL LIST OF PROJECTS TO CONGRESS.—Until the date on which all of the amounts in the Fund are expended, the President shall annually submit to Congress, together with the annual budget of the United States, a list of projects to be funded from the Fund that includes a detailed description of each project, including the estimated expenditures from the Fund for the project for the applicable fiscal year.

“(i) ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Appropriations Acts may provide for alternate allocation of amounts made available under this section, consistent with the allocations to covered agencies under subsection (e)(1).

“(2) ALLOCATION BY PRESIDENT.—

“(A) NO ALTERNATE ALLOCATIONS.—If Congress has not enacted legislation establishing alternate allocations by the date on which the Act making full-year appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies for the applicable fiscal year is enacted into law, amounts made available under subsection (c) shall be allocated by the President.

“(B) INSUFFICIENT ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—If Congress enacts legislation establishing alternate allocations for amounts made available under subsection (c) that are less than the full amount appropriated under that subsection, the difference between the amount appropriated and the alternate allocation shall be allocated by the President.

“(j) PUBLIC DONATIONS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture may accept public cash or in-kind donations that advance efforts—

“(A) to reduce the deferred maintenance backlog; and

“(B) to encourage relevant public-private partnerships.

“(2) CREDITS TO FUND.—Any cash donations accepted under paragraph (1) shall be—

“(A) credited to, and form a part of, the Fund; and

“(B) allocated to the covered agency for which the donation was made.

“(3) OTHER ALLOCATIONS.—Any donations allocated to a covered agency under paragraph (2)(B) shall be allocated to the applicable covered agency independently of the allocations under subsection (e)(1).

“(k) REQUIRED CONSIDERATION FOR ACCESSIBILITY.—In expending amounts from the Fund, the Secretary and the Secretary of Agriculture shall incorporate measures to improve the accessibility of assets and accommodate visitors and employees with disabilities in accordance with applicable law.”.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for subtitle II of title 54, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the item relating to chapter 2003 the following:

“2004. National Parks and Public

Land Legacy Restoration Fund ...200401”.

(c) GAO STUDY.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Comptroller General of the United States shall—

(1) conduct a study on the implementation of this section and the amendments made by this section, including whether this section and the amendments made by this section have effectively reduced the priority deferred maintenance backlog of the covered agencies (as that term is defined in section 200401 of title 54, United States Code); and

(2) submit to Congress a report that describes the results of the study under paragraph (1).

SEC. 3. PERMANENT FULL FUNDING OF THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 200303 of title 54, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 200303. Availability of funds

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Any amounts deposited in the Fund under section 200302 for fiscal year 2020 and each fiscal year thereafter shall be made available for expenditure for fiscal year 2021 and each fiscal year thereafter, without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation, to carry out the purposes of the Fund (including accounts and programs made available from the Fund pursuant to the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (Public Law 116-94; 133 Stat. 2534)).

“(b) ADDITIONAL AMOUNTS.—Amounts made available under subsection (a) shall be in addition to amounts made available to the Fund under section 105 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note; Public Law 109-432) or otherwise appropriated from the Fund.

“(c) ALLOCATION AUTHORITY.—

“(1) SUBMISSION OF COST ESTIMATES.—The President shall submit to Congress detailed account, program, and project allocations of the full amount made available under subsection (a)—

“(A) for fiscal year 2021, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the Great American Outdoors Act; and

“(B) for each fiscal year thereafter, as part of the annual budget submission of the President.

“(2) ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—Appropriations Acts may provide for alternate allocation of amounts made available under subsection (a), including allocations by account, program, and project.

“(B) ALLOCATION BY PRESIDENT.—

“(i) NO ALTERNATE ALLOCATIONS.—If Congress has not enacted legislation establishing alternate allocations by the date on which the Act making full-year appropriations for the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies for the applicable fiscal year is enacted into law,

amounts made available under subsection (a) shall be allocated by the President.

“(ii) INSUFFICIENT ALTERNATE ALLOCATION.—If Congress enacts legislation establishing alternate allocations for amounts made available under subsection (a) that are less than the full amount appropriated under that subsection, the difference between the amount appropriated and the alternate allocation shall be allocated by the President.

“(3) RECREATIONAL PUBLIC ACCESS.—Amounts expended from the Fund under this section shall be consistent with the requirements for recreational public access for hunting, fishing, recreational shooting, or other outdoor recreational purposes under section 200306(c).

“(4) ANNUAL REPORT.—The President shall submit to Congress an annual report that describes the final allocation by account, program, and project of amounts made available under subsection (a), including a description of the status of obligations and expenditures.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 200302(c) of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (3).

(2) Section 200306(a)(2)(B) of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking clause (iii).

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 200303 and inserting the following:

“200303. Availability of funds.”.

SA 1618. Mr. GARDNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

Amend the title so as to read: “An Act to amend title 54, United States Code, to establish, fund, and provide for the use of amounts in a National Parks and Public Land Legacy Restoration Fund to address the maintenance backlog of the National Park Service, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Forest Service, and the Bureau of Indian Education, and to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes.”.

SA 1619. Ms. MURKOWSKI (for herself, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. CORNYN, Mr. RISCH, Mr. SULLIVAN, and Mr. CRAPO) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

On page 12, lines 11 through 14, strike “(including accounts and programs made available from the Fund pursuant to the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (Public Law 116-94; 133 Stat 2534))”.

On page 12, lines 19 and 20, strike “or otherwise appropriated from the Fund”.

On page 14, strike lines 19 through 23 and insert the following:

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 200302(c) of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking paragraph (3).

On page 15, after the matter following line 2, add the following:

SEC. 4. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES FROM THE LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.

Section 200305 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following:

“(4) Facility rehabilitation and maintenance.”;

(2) in subsection (b)(4), in the second sentence, by striking “, or development” and inserting “, development, or facility rehabilitation and maintenance”;

(3) in subsection (c), in the first sentence, by striking “, or development” and inserting “, development, or facility rehabilitation and maintenance”;

(4) in subsection (f)(1), in the first sentence, by striking “, or development” and inserting “, development, or facility rehabilitation and maintenance”;

(5) in subsection (j), in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “, and development” and inserting “, development, and facility rehabilitation and maintenance”.

SEC. 5. ALLOCATION OF LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND AMOUNTS FOR OTHER RELATED PURPOSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by redesignating sections 200307 through 2003010 as sections 200308 through 2003011, respectively; and

(2) by inserting after section 200306 the following:

“§ 200307. Allocation of Fund amounts for other related purposes

“Amounts deposited in the Fund under section 200302 may be allotted by the President for any of the following other related purposes:

“(1) The Forest Legacy Program established under section 7 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2103c).

“(2) Cooperative endangered species grants authorized under section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1535).

“(3) The American Battlefield Protection Program established under chapter 3081.

“(4) The uses authorized under section 31(d) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1356a(d)).

“(5) The provision of grants from the National Oceans and Coastal Security Fund authorized under section 904(a) of the National Oceans and Coastal Security Act (16 U.S.C. 7503(a)).

“(6) The uses authorized for the Wildlife Conservation and Restoration Account under section 3(c) of the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act (16 U.S.C. 669b(c)).

“(7) The program for the Highlands region established under the Highlands Conservation Act (Public Law 108-421; 118 Stat. 2375).”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 200302(b)(2) of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking “200310” and inserting “200311”.

(c) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, is amended by striking the items relating to sections 200307 through 2003010 and inserting the following:

“200307. Allocation of Fund amounts for other related purposes.

“200308. Availability of Fund amounts for publicity purposes.

“200309. Contracts for acquisition of land and water.

“200310. Contracts for options to acquire land and water in System.

“200311. Transfers to and from Fund.”.

SA 1620. Mrs. FEINSTEIN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed

by her to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

At the end, add the following:

SEC. ____ . PROHIBITION OF OIL AND GAS LEASING ON THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF OFF THE COAST OF CALIFORNIA, OREGON, AND WASHINGTON.

Section 8 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1337) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(q) PROHIBITION OF OIL AND GAS LEASING IN CERTAIN AREAS OF THE OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section or any other law, the Secretary shall not issue a lease for the exploration, development, or production of oil or natural gas in any area of the outer Continental Shelf off the coast of the State of California, Oregon, or Washington.”.

SA 1621. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 200402(c) of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), strike “subsection (e)” and insert “subsection (d)”.

In section 200402 of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), strike subsection (d).

In section 200402(i)(1) of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), strike “subsection (e)(1)” and insert “subsection (d)(1)”.

In section 200402(j)(3) of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), strike “subsection (e)(1)” and insert “subsection (d)(1)”.

In section 200402 of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), redesignate subsections (e) through (k) as subsections (d) through (j), respectively.

SA 1622. Mr. CRUZ submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill H.R. 1957, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modernize and improve the Internal Revenue Service, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table; as follows:

In section 200402(c) of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 2(a)), strike “without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation” and insert “only as provided in advance in an appropriations Act”.

In section 200303(a) of title 54, United States Code (as added by section 3(a)), strike “without further appropriation or fiscal year limitation” and insert “only as provided in advance in an appropriations Act”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I have 12 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 10:15 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 2:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The Committee on the Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 3 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AIRLAND

The Subcommittee on Airland of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 11 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON CYBERSECURITY

The Subcommittee on Cybersecurity of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 5:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

The Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

The Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 2 p.m., to conduct a hearing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SEAPOWER

The Subcommittee on Seapower of the Committee on Armed Services is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, June 9, 2020, at 3:30 p.m., to conduct a hearing. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the provision of rule XXII, the postcloture time with respect to the motion to proceed to H.R. 1957 expire at 12:15 tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 2020

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Wednesday, June 10; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate resume consideration of the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 75, H.R. 1957, under the previous order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of Senator LEE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

THE GREAT AMERICAN OUTDOORS ACT

Mr. LEE. Madam President, to most Americans, the so-called Great American Outdoors Act is a mistake. It is expensive, shortsighted, and it is wrong; but to those of us who live in the American West, it is a disaster. Despite its rosy claims, this legislation combines two bills that will only tighten the Federal stranglehold on our lands and drive us deeper into debt, to the detriment of our economy, our environment, and the livelihoods and the freedom of the American people.

So just how, you might ask, does it do that? Well, let me explain. The first title containing an expanded version of the Restore Our Parks Act attempts to address the roughly \$19.3 billion maintenance backlog on our Federal lands, concentrated primarily within national parks projects, which approach a \$12 billion maintenance backlog just on their own, but it seeks to do so by spending \$9.5 billion of Federal offshore energy revenues over 5 years, without any means whatsoever of offsetting those extra funds.

Now, that, to be clear, is money that is currently going to the U.S. Treasury to pay for a number of other costs, a

number of other expenditures—from aircraft carriers to Federal courts and everything in between—and will only add to our already ballooning national debt.

It is, we have to remember, Congress's job to set priorities for the funds in the Treasury. If we prioritize something—if we prioritize one thing—we must either proportionately decrease the funding for something else or find another way to generate new revenue.

This bill does neither. Furthermore, without any measures to prevent it, it guarantees that a similar backlog will only reemerge in the future. There are better ways to address this problem. For example, there are much better ways in a proposal that has been introduced by Senator ENZI in a bill called the REAL Act. The REAL Act would modestly increase park visitor fees by \$5, businesses and tourist visa fees by \$25, and a visa waiver program fee by \$16—estimated to bring an additional \$5.5 billion in revenue over the next 10 years.

This, the REAL Act, introduced by Senator ENZI is a reasonable, practical solution to sustainably address the maintenance backlog on our National Parks, which is a problem. It is a problem that needs to be dealt with, and the REAL Act does it in a very responsible, sustainable fashion. What is more, the REAL Act would create a permanent and independent way of supplementing the funding for our National Parks and do so without adding to the national debt.

The second title of this bill—of the Great American Outdoors Act—creates almost \$1 billion of mandatory spending every single year on new Federal land acquisition through the Land and Water Conservation Fund. In other words, it adds a new entitlement, adding to our already unaffordable system of entitlements. It puts it on a level playing field with things like Social Security and Medicare, other entitlement programs, the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

Now, why would we do this when we are already on a collision course with our ability to fund Federal programs, including and especially those programs that America's seniors have paid for, for years, and come to rely on? Why would we do that for this program? Why make it mandatory spending and thus convert it into yet another unaffordable entitlement program?

Let's talk a little bit about the Land and Water Conservation Fund, or LWCF, as it is known. This was originally put in place pursuant to a law passed in 1964, and the LWCF, as it was created and enacted into law back in 1964, was put in place in order to promote and preserve access to recreational opportunities on Federal public lands—on public lands generally, in fact. So the fund was set up to be the principal source of money for Federal land acquisition and to assist States in

developing recreational opportunities on their own.

Originally, it directed 60 percent of its funds to be appropriated for State purposes and 40 percent for Federal purposes. Unfortunately, the program has since drifted far from its original moorings and far from its original intent, and it has been rife with abuse. In 1976, the law was amended to remove the 60-percent State provision, stating simply that not less than 40 percent of the funds must be used for Federal purposes, while remaining silent on whether a State would receive a penny.

Now, just over the last year or so, not less than 40 percent of the funds are dedicated to State purposes, so that still means that up to 60 percent of the funds can still be used for Federal land acquisition. The result? Well, it hasn't been good. It has been used more for Federal land acquisition than for improving access to or care of the vast Federal lands that we already own and manage—or in many cases, fail to manage.

Sixty-one percent of the funds have historically been used for acquisition, compared to the 25 percent that have been allocated to State grants, spending close to \$12 billion to purchase new Federal lands.

So despite people's images of charming ribbon cuttings at local parks and scenic wildlife, the LWCF has functioned as the Federal Government's primary vehicle for Federal land grabs, resulting in a massive, restrictive, and neglected Federal estate.

The Federal Government now owns 640 million acres of land—more than 640 million acres—within the United States. To put this in perspective, this amount—the more than 640 million acres of land currently owned by the Federal Government within the United States—is a total larger than the entireties of France, Spain, Germany, Poland, Italy, the United Kingdom, Austria, Switzerland, and the Netherlands combined.

Now, I am not talking about the government-owned lands or the parklands within those countries. I am talking about the entirety of the countries themselves. The Federal Government owns more land than that. That is 28 percent of the total acreage within the United States, and more than 50 percent of the land in the West. This has proven to be far more land than the Federal Government is capable of managing responsibly. The condition of the vast Federal estate ranges from fair to poor to dismal. These lands face problems with rampant wildfires, soil erosion, mismanagement, and littering—with a staggering combined maintenance backlog of nearly \$20 billion.

Resources are only being spread thinner as they are being stretched to serve more and more lands—more and more lands that are now going to be bought with the new entitlement spending that we are putting in place with this bill should we enact this ill-conceived legislative proposal.

On top of that, many of the LWCF funds have been diverted to a vague “other purposes” category that has, in many instances, little to do with access to outdoor recreation at all. In fact, many of the programs it has funded have, instead, aimed to pull land from public use, regardless of how the land in question is classified. So rather than increasing opportunities for hunting and fishing, snowmobiling, hiking, camping, mountain biking, or kayaking, the land policies in place have slowly been squeezing out recreational opportunities, and this has been going on for decades.

And so, too, have these policies imposed severe economic restrictions. As the Federal estate has grown since the time the LWCF was established in 1964, natural resource production—including mining, energy, timber, and livestock raising—have sharply declined, depriving rural communities and their economies of crucial jobs and economic activity.

Timber production, for example, has been cut by about 90 percent since the 1980s. So instead of providing sustainable, renewable, economically productive logging in the Northwest, these forests are now managed by catastrophic wildfire under the supervision—or I should say the failed supervision—of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

If you don't believe me, ask anyone who lives in the Western United States. Ask anyone who lives in the communities of Utah who have seen the environmental and economic devastation brought about as a result of failed land management policies.

Now, some claim, rather audaciously, that the outdoor recreation economy is a major boon to these very same communities that are being impoverished by it. But usually, nearly always, people who say that aren't people who live in those communities.

Seasonal tourism is not a sustainable core industry for most communities. Much of the money spent on outdoor recreation ends up going to apparel, equipment, and gear from large out-of-state companies. Rural public lands counties don't see a penny of it. This is especially true in those counties where the Federal Government owns not just 67 percent of the land mass, as is the case throughout Utah as a whole, but 90, 95 percent plus of the land in some counties.

To make matters worse, Federal lands also mean a loss of property taxes and, as a result, a loss of huge sources of revenue and opportunities for States and for local communities. It is no coincidence that the poorest rural counties in the West are the very same communities, the very same counties where they have the most Federal land. The poorest counties are the counties with the most Federal land.

Why is that? Well, there are a number of reasons, but one of the things that has to be taken into account is

the fact that, without property taxes, schools are underfunded, local governments are crippled, fire departments are, ironically, depleted and, therefore, unable to properly take care of the lands they are charged to protect in the first place. This, by the way, says nothing of the loss of economic activity as a whole. I am just talking here about the lack of property tax revenue.

Now, there is a Federal program for this, the Payment in Lieu of Taxes Program, also known as the PILT Program, as the abbreviation refers. This is a program that was intended to address this disparity by compensating counties and local communities for their loss of property taxes—that is the loss from property taxes that comes about as a result of significant Federal land ownership and the Federal Government's declaration, by law, that its lands may not be taxed. But PILT payments have provided only a pittance of what would be due to local governments were Federal lands not exempt from property taxes.

In 2018, the Utah Legislature commissioned a state-of-the-art evaluation of 32 million acres of Federal land in Utah, excluding roughly 3 million acres of National Parks and Wilderness Areas. Now, this May, that same commission found that appraising these BLM and Forest Service lands according to their lowest use value would result in an annual property tax bill of \$534 million. And this, by the way, in addition to excluding National Parks and Wilderness Areas from that equation, was a study that involved only those Federal lands extending to within 1 mile of any municipal boundary or of any city or town in Utah. So this fraction would produce \$534 million annually in property tax revenue, even if it were taxed at its lowest value.

In 2019, the PILT payments to Utah statewide totaled just \$41 million, just 7.7 percent of the potential revenue from property taxes. Again, we are not talking about the National Parks or their National Wilderness Areas, nor are we talking about the lands outside of 1 mile beyond any municipal boundary.

And while States and localities are the ones carrying the unfair economic burden, Washington only pours salt in these wounds by neglecting its oversight responsibilities. In May 2019, a GAO report found that BLM fails to maintain centralized data on lands acquired and that an increasing element of LWCF funds across agencies are being spent on acquisition projects that occur without and, in some cases, contrary to congressional approval.

Not only that, but a December 2019 GAO report found that numerous agencies have blatantly disregarded LWCF requirements in order to illegally purchase more land. Yes. They are buying land, in many cases, contrary to their statutory authorization and limitations imposed by law. Under the original LWCF Act, no more than 15 percent of the land added to the National For-

est System is to be west of the 100th meridian, essentially everything west of Oklahoma. But the GAO found that between fiscal years 2014 and 2018, the Federal Government had acquired more than 450,000 acres of land in the United States, more than 80 percent of which were west of the 100th meridian. In another recent review of land acquisition policies across the agencies conducted by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture, officials said that 40 percent of the land acquired with LWCF funds were not even requested by the agencies—not requested in the first place, yet they were purchased in some cases contrary to an explicit statutory command.

As it turns out, billions of LWCF dollars are being spent without the Congress and without the relevant agencies or the public being informed of where or why or pursuant to what authority they were made. Why, then, would it ever make sense to turn this into an entitlement program, to turn this into something that is self-perpetuating—into a self-licking ice cream cone—that needs no support or reauthorization year to year from Congress?

Last year, the Senate permanently reauthorized this broken, harmful, dangerous, unaccountable fund without reform and without any incentive to offer future reforms, but as if that weren't bad enough, the legislation before us now proposes to make that funding mandatory.

Before, Congress could at least appropriate varying amounts to be used from the fund. Now, this bill, if passed, would turn the LWCF into a true trust fund, automatically requiring that the full \$900 million be spent primarily on Federal land acquisition each year in perpetuity without accountability and without oversight. The unofficial Congressional Budget Office score estimates that this bill, as a whole, will cost nearly \$17.3 billion over the next 10 years, all for land projects that we cannot afford, let alone maintain.

This is not how Congress was tasked with exercising the power of the purse. This is not how it is supposed to work—not in this country and certainly not in this legislative body.

It is the tough business of Congress to set priorities and to decide which, among worthy causes, should receive our limited resources. These funds could be going to provide relief in the midst of the current pandemic or to our national defense or to shoring up benefits for veterans or to a myriad of other goals. Putting these funds into a direct deposit mechanism, however, means that we are not having those conversations and not actively evaluating how we can best spend those taxpayer dollars each year. No, no. Instead, we are going to put it on autopilot. That is what this bill wants to do rather shamefully.

This provision of the bill automatically puts more funds toward the harmful cause of growing the Federal

estate, putting us on an even worse path than we have already taken. In fact, the first provision of the bill is only evidence to the fact that we have bitten off far more than we can chew.

We can do better. As it currently stands, we have nothing to gain from this legislation. The agenda of aggressively and endlessly growing our Federal estate has put us on a dangerous path with devastating effects for our lands and for the people who live, recreate, and survive off of them as my home State of Utah has already experienced far too well. If we do not change course, this path will only worsen for the rest of the Nation too.

I want to point out something—a common misperception that people often have about Federal land and what it is and what it does. In many cases, if you don't live in the western United States, you are not necessarily aware of the fact that the overwhelming majority—not just most but the overwhelming majority of Federal land is not a national park. National parks are some of the few things people consistently like about the Federal Government. They are frequently the favorite thing about the Federal Government. We all love national parks. They are beautiful. They are fun, and they are something that the Federal Government does that everyone still enjoys and loves. But most Federal land is not a national park. The overwhelming majority isn't anything like a national park, and the way these lands are divided out really isn't fair.

In every State east of Colorado, the Federal Government owns less than 15 percent of the land. In every State to the west of Colorado and including Colorado, the Federal Government owns at least 15 percent and, in many cases, many multiples of that. In my State it happens to be about 67 percent. A tiny segment of that land consists of national park land. Most of it is just land that you can't use for anything else. The local governments can't tax them, and people can't access them for economic or recreational purposes without a “Mother, may I?” from the Federal Government. That is what it is. Most of this land isn't even a national park or a national recreation area or a wilderness area or anything remotely worthy of that. This is just about Federal control, and most of it is not managed very well.

The National Park System has been underfunded. They, in many ways, do the best job they can with what they have, but they have been chronically underfunded, and the national parks are quite well run compared to the vast majority of Federal public land we have, which is chronically neglected, environmentally mismanaged, often to the economic and environmental detriment of those States where there is a lot of Federal land.

Take San Juan County, UT. The Federal Government owns somewhere along the order of 95 percent of the land in San Juan County. It also happens to be Utah's poorest county.

These two issues are not a coincidence. The fact that they appear in the same land mass is not coincidental; it is causal. The Federal Government is the cause for the impoverishment of this county and other communities in Utah and throughout the United States. Why? Because people can't own the land, can't develop the land, can't tax the land to fund their schools, their search and rescue services, or any other government priority. Nor can they access it for most economic purposes.

Finally, all of my other observations about this legislation notwithstanding, this is the Senate, and just like church is for sinners, the Senate floor isn't for perfect, hermetically sealed, finished bills. We are supposed to bring imperfect bills to the floor to debate and deliberate and amend and discuss and, ultimately, find consensus. That is why I and many of my colleagues have been trying to do exactly that in this very situation with this very bill.

I have a number of amendments. Many western State Senators do as well. Several Gulf State Senators have their own concerns about this bill in its current form. The way the process is supposed to work is that we bring this and other bills like it to the floor, and we offer up changes and see where the Senate is, see where the process goes, using reason, gentle persuasion, and awkward improvements to each piece of legislation as our guide. That is how it is supposed to work.

There are a number of Senators from western States, from Gulf States, and from States that really aren't in the West or the gulf that don't really have that much to do with Federal public land, but they can see the procedural and substantive defects of this bill. That is why many of us who really would like to make improvements to this bill have come together from different parts of the country.

The process of actually legislating has gone out of fashion in Washington and, quite regrettably, out of this Chamber in recent years, but it is something that I think the whole Senate would like to get back to—and I mean the whole Senate, Democrats and Republicans alike. This is an issue that is neither Republican or Democratic; it is not liberal or conservative; it is not Libertarian. It is not an ideological viewpoint. I know people within this

Chamber on virtually every point along the ideological political continuum who would very much like to see the Senate working as an actual legislative body rather than as a rubberstamp for whatever small handful of people happen to write out behind closed doors and decide must be the finished, perfect, hermetically sealed object of our vote. This is wrong. It is an insult, not just to the 100 Senators who are here. It is that to be sure, but nobody cares about that. It is more about those we represent, those who elected us. Those election certificates don't belong to us. They belong to the voters of our various States who expect us to represent them. Regardless of how we might vote on any particular piece of legislation, they expect us to have read it; they expect us to do our job by showing up and by offering to make it better where we see flaws and we see defects. There is no perfect bill, but we can still make legislation a lot less bad. We can make it better. We bring about actual consensus. Consensus is not found by ramming something through without an opportunity for amendment, debate, or discussion.

This is wrong. It has gone on for far too long. I have seen it under the leadership of Democrats and Republicans alike in this Chamber, and it has to end. It will end. The question is, How long is it going to take us and how much misery will the American people have to endure while most of their Senators are effectively locked out of meaningful legislative debate, discussion, and amendment? This is wrong, and it has to end.

The debate on this bill has now been extended by a whole extra day. There is no earthly reason why we can't use that extra day to work through a handful of 15-minute votes on a handful of amendments. It is just not that hard. In the amount of time that I have been speaking tonight, we could have processed a couple of amendments. In the amount of time that will be devoted only to hand-wringing and dismissal of legitimate concerns with this legislation, we could process any amendment that anyone wants to introduce, and this legislation could still be passed weeks before the House of Representatives is even poised to return. So why are we not doing this? There is no persuasive answer here.

We have to start doing our job. I look forward to working with our colleagues to get an agreement on some amendments so that we can give this legislation the due consideration and the careful deliberation that it deserves, that we deserve, that those who elected us deserve, and then move on to the important nominations pending before the Senate and to the National Defense Authorization Act that are next in line. In the meantime, I hope Democrats and Republicans alike can unite behind the fact that we can't skate forever under the mantra that the Senate is the world's greatest deliberative body when it does not deliberate. The good news is, it is entirely within our power to reclaim use of that title justifiably and with dignity.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:32 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, June 10, 2020, at 10 a.m.

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination under the authority of the order of the Senate of 01/07/2009 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

*JOHN CHASE JOHNSON, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION.

*Nominee has committed to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 9, 2020:

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT AS CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE, AND APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE TO THE GRADE INDICATED WHILE ASSIGNED TO A POSITION OF IMPORTANCE AND RESPONSIBILITY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 601 AND 9033:

To be general

GEN. CHARLES Q. BROWN, JR.